A KEY TO THE "TRUSTEES' STATEMENT."

LETTERS

TO THE

MAJORITY OF THE TRUSTEES

OF THE

DUDLEY OBSERVATORY,

SHOWING THE

MISREPRESENTATIONS, GARBLINGS AND PERVERSIONS

OF THEIR

MIS-STATEMENT,

BY

GEORGE H. THACHER.

FROM THE ATLAS & ARGUS,
OCTOBER, 1858.

A KEY TO THE "TRUSTEE'S STATEMENT."

LETTERS

TO THE

MAJORITY OF THE TRUSTEES

OF THE

DUDLEY OBSERVATORY,

SHOWING THE

MISREPRESENTATIONS, GARBLINGS AND PERVERSIONS

OF THEIR

MIS-STATEMENT.

BY

GEORGE H. THACHER.

FROM THE ATLAS & ARGUS,
OCTOBER, 1858.

522.19
T32k

INDEX.

		Page.
	INTRODUCTION,	3.
I.	ANIMUS OF THE STATEMENT,	12.
II.	CURIOSITIES OF THE STATEMENT,	25.
III.	DR. GOULD'S INCOMPETENCY,	31.
IV.	GARBLINGS AND PERVERSIONS,	39.
V.	GARBLINGS AND PERVERSIONS,	48.
VI.	GARBLINGS AND PERVERSIONS,	59.
VII.	GARBLINGS AND PERVERSIONS,	70.
VIII.	GARBLINGS AND PERVERSIONS,	85.
IX.	DR. GOULD AND THE FINANCES, *(Dialogue,)*	91.
X.	SUPPOSED DIALOGUE CONTINUED,	99.
XI.	ACT OF INCORPORATION,	112.
XII.	LETTER BY THE AUTHOR TO HON. ERASTUS CORNING, AND MR. CORNING'S REPLY,	116.
XIII.	LETTER BY J. V. L. PRUYN, ESQ.,	121.

J. Beaman

INTRODUCTION.

TO THE FRIENDS OF THE DUDLEY OBSERVATORY.

The public are already familiar with the main points involved in the unhappy controversy between the Nine Trustees of the Dudley Observatory, and the founders and Scientific Council of that Institution. The controversy was made known to the world by Mr. Olcott's publishing in the Albany and New York papers gross charges against Dr. Gould, the Director, in which he is presented as a liar, a peculator, a reckless squanderer of the Trustee's money, and a quack astronomer. Up to that moment no man in the United States stood higher or was more distinguished for all the qualities opposite to those attributed to him by Mr. Olcott, than Dr. Gould. His friends were amazed. None more so than his associate members of the Scientific Council, who had known him intimately for many years. They had a right to expect, on the ground of courtesy, and in fact, on all the grounds of fair dealing recognised among honorable men, that they should be the first to receive and the first to have the opportunity to investigate any and all charges to be preferred. But Mr. Olcott, with an impulsive precipitancy which he will regret to the last hour of his life, without apparently a moment's reflection on the gravity of the charges, without pausing to consider the deep wound he was about to inflict on a fellow being whose feelings were tender and whose reputation was dearer to him than all things else,

not excepting life itself—Mr. Olcott, a man who has only lately professed to be actuated and governed by the gospel religion, whose chief element is that charity which "suffers long and is kind"—which is "first pure, then peacable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, *full* of mercy and good fruits," hastens into the arena of public strife and openly assails Dr. Gould in the mode and to the extent described. All this was done too without the previous knowledge of, or warning to the Scientific Council. Conduct like this in all its prominent comparisons has never yet been known among men. The other members of the Council came to Albany and made all possible offers of conciliation. They asked for the evidences to be laid before them to support the charges, and that Dr. Gould should have a hearing. Two of the Trustees urged Mr. Olcott to call a meeting of the board and allow them to act upon this and the two following propositions. He refused. Even Robert H. Pruyn, one of the nine Trustees, has since expressed the most emphatic disapprobation of the singular proceeding. The council also proposed to leave the whole matter to the investigation and decision of impartial men. This was refused. Thereupon they proposed to take charge of the Observatory for a time themselves, each supervising it alternately, without reference to Dr. Gould. This was refused. Mrs. Dudley who had given the munificent sum of nearly $80,000, proposed that the Trustees should resign and place the Observatory in other hands. This was refused. About the 20th of August, last, thirty-one donors, representing more than three-fourths of the whole amount contributed to the Observatory, presented a petition to the Trustees, through George W. Blunt, Esq., imploring them, in order to prevent scandal and to avoid the ruinous consequences that have since ensued and are yet to ensue, to refer the controversy to the arbitrament of such distinguished gentlemen as Bishop Horatio Potter, President Charles King, Ex-Governor Washington

Hunt, J. Ingersoll Bowditch, and Hon. Gullian C. Ver Planck. The signatures to the petition were as follows:

NEW-YORK.

Wm. Oathout,
Sun Mut. Insurance Co.,
James Brown,
R. Withers,
Atlantic Mutual Insurance Co.,
Meredith Howland,
J. C. Green,
Goodhue & Co.,
Robert H. Minturn,
E. & G. W. Blunt,
H. Chancey,
C. Barstow,
M. Livingston,
Wm. F. Carey,
Wm. B. Astor,
Solomon Townsend,
Howes & Co.,
A. C. Richards.

BOSTON.

Edward Everett,
M. Wigglesworth,
J. Wigglesworth,
B. A, Gould,
Martin Brimmer,
J. B. Lincoln,
N. Thayer,

ALBANY.

Blandina Dudley,
Stephen Van Rensselaer
M. T. Reynolds,
A. M. Strong,
John Taylor,
R. Townsend.

The nine Trustees never deigned even the civility to acknowledge the reception of the petition or to reply directly to the petitioners. Subsequently they noticed it in their so called Statement. And how? On page 172 they say that the proposition "Is equivalent to a submission of the question whether the Trustees shall abandon the Observatory and surrender their trust altogether."

To illustrate the absurdity and ridiculous inconsistency of this excuse let me now state a fact. In the fore-part of January last, Mr. Olcott and others of his co-majority Trustees were exceedingly anxious to *appoint* Dr. Peters, the discoverer of the Olcott Comet, to the office of Observer. Conscious that they were doing a wrong, they set to work to entrap many of our citizens and several donors into signing a petition to the board, or which is the same

thing, to *themselves*, asking that the appointment be made. John V. L. Pruyn, as he abundantly proves in his very able letter on the subject, was induced to sign it, and through him, others, by *positive misrepresentation* on the part of Mr. Olcott. The trick succeeded. Immediately the board met and passed the following resolution :—

Resolved, That in obedience to its own convictions of duty and of policy, and in compliance with the expressed wishes of so many of the largest donors to the Dudley Observatory, this Board of Trustees do hereby appoint Dr. C. H. F. Peters, as an Observer in this Institution.

Under the pretense of complying with the "expressed wishes of so many of the largest donors to the Dudley Observatory," they passed that resolution. When the *appointing* power was to be exercised, they could get up a *petition* to *themselves*—procure signatures to it by gross misrepresentation, and then pretend to comply with it out of *consideration* for "the *expressed* wishes of so many of the largest donors." But when the *dismissing* power is involved, a petition signed by thirty-one donors, simply requesting the Trustees to consent to a reference of the difficulties, the petition and petitioners are treated with scorn. They are cavalierly dismissed with a plain intimation that, in the opinion of the majority Trustees, they are meddling with matters that do not belong to them. The advocates of an unjust cause always fear the decision of impartial referees. There was the pinch. The excuse made is most flimsy and impotent.

But to resume the chain of facts. When the Scientific Council had tried every measure of conciliation and had exhausted all possible expedients to check Mr. Olcott in his mad career, they felt it to be due to the public, the donors, to themselves, and especially to Dr. Gould, to make a thorough investigation of the charges preferred. They performed the duty rigorously and carefully, and published a "DEFENCE OF DR. GOULD" in which they completely exonerated him from blame and pledged their own reputations in his favor by the unqualified averment that all these charges were

without foundation. Following the DEFENCE came the so-called "Statement" of the majority Trustees. In this far-famed document, these gentlemen reiterate their former charges, add more, and attempt to sustain them. How? By the use of *mutilated*, *distorted*, *perverted*, and in some cases partially fabricated extracts from Dr. Gould's letters. Immediately after the publication of the "Statement," Dr. Gould, under his own signature, informed the public of this fact, and gave several examples. Seventeen days subsequently to this, after having ample time to compare the pretended extracts with the original letters in their possession, these majority Trustees published the following communication. Let the reader specially mark the words I have italicised.

REPLY OF THE TRUSTEES TO THE CHARGE OF GARBLING.

The Trustees of the Dudley Observatory, having been publicly charged by Dr. B. A. Gould. Jr., with garbling certain letters written by him, in such a manner as to falsify and pervert his meaning, and with having fabricated one or more letters, and parts of letters, deem it proper to state that there is no more truth in these charges, than there was in any of the numerous false accusations made against them by the same party prior to the publication of their Statement.

While it is true that in some instances large portions of letters of very great length have been omitted, mainly for the sake of brevity; and in some other instances, through circumstances that will hereafter be explained, here and there a word has been accidentally changed, and some verbal inaccuracies have thus occurred, *it is entirely untrue that Dr. Gould's meaning has, in any case, been perverted; that any alteration, omission or addition has been made, in the slightest degree prejudicial to him or favorable to the case of the Trustees; or that any letter or sentence not actually written by Dr. Gould, and the original of which is not in their possession, has been published in their Statement.*

The Trustees are aware that their own friends, and all who are personally acquainted with Dr. Gould, will need no assurance that the charges now made against them are without any foundation. To those of the public to whom all the parties to this controversy are unknown, the Trustees desire to say that they have a satisfactory explanation to give, of all the cases of pretended "garbling" which have as yet been cited. As additional charges and a more specific reply to their statements are promised, the Trustees withhold their answer to Dr. Gould's last pamphlet until that reply shall appear. At the proper moment these letters, *with all their contents*, may be given to the public.

In the meantime, the Trustees challenge Dr. Gould to specify the letter or letters, the whole or any part of which he never wrote. They will prove his allegations in this respect to be as destitute of truth, as they have already shown his statements to be, in other instances.

THOMAS W. OLCOTT,
IRA HARRIS,
WILLIAM H. DEWITT,
JOHN F. RATHBONE,
ALDEN MARCH,
SAMUEL H. RANSOM,
ISAAC W. VOSBURGH,
ROBERT H. PRUYN,
JAMES H. ARMSBY.

Dr. Gould replied to this communication, re-asserting with absolute positiveness what he had alleged. In order to bring the question to a fair test, he offered, in that reply, the following proposition:

"Under these circumstances, I desire to submit the following questions to the judgment of some impartial tribunal:

1. Whether the Statement of the nine Trustees does not contain extracts from letters essentially private and unofficial?

2. Whether it does not contain portions of letters which were actually marked with the words, "Private" or "Confidential?"

3. Whether any of these letters, prior to January, 1858, were addressed, either to the Trustees, or to any of their officers, in their official capacity?

4. What proportion of the extracts were published correctly?

5. Whether my meaning has not been perverted?

6. Whether alterations, omissions and additions prejudicial to me, or favorable to the case of the Trustees, have not been made?

7. Whether sentences not actually written by me have not been published?

I can see no better means of attaining the desired end than the following: If Messrs. Olcott, Harris and Armsby, with their associates, will name two impartial men, and place the original letters in their hands, I will also name two and submit my letter-books. These four gentlemen shall select a fifth and proceed to compare the passages cited with the original letters and with their press-copies, since any comparison which does not embrace these facsimiles would be manifestly unjust. The committee shall report distinctly upon the seven points above enumerated. I will abide the issue.

To this day the majority Trustees have shown no indications of a willingness to meet the issue and their denial of the fact of the garblings, as given in their own words, remains UNRETRACTED.

In these circumstances I began and wrote the article signed "ALBANY" without any solicitation either directly or remotely from any mortal being on earth. I first took the trouble to investigate the case for my own satisfaction. My conclusions were and are still that not a single charge made in the "Statement" of the majority Trustees is sustained even in the slightest degree by the pretended extracts adduced, and *without these*, as the reader will see, by reading my articles and the Statement, all the charges must remain unsustained till other and better evidence is presented. Dr. Gould's press-copies are open to the inspection of any fair-minded man. The Trustees *dare not* deliver the original letters into the hands of impartial men and allow the comparison to be made with these press-copies. Nor do I believe they will ever carry out their threat and publish the entire letters truthfully and without alteration. If they do, they will publish to the world the *evidences* of their own infamy. Not only that, but they will *release* Dr. Gould from all honorable obligation whatever to withhold from the public eye certain letters which he has, because they will be necessary to a correct understanding of those he wrote in reply to them. Should this be forced upon him, he will have no occasion to say one word more in his own defence. At present there are no symptoms of relenting on the part of Dr. Gould's persecutors. They will go on, beyond doubt, and blunder as they have done thus far. They have now retreated behind one solitary rampart and that is that they have the *legal right* to possession of the Observatory property. In defiance, to use their own language, "of the expressed wishes of so many of the largest donors to the Observatory"—in defiance of the wishes of all the ablest Scientific men of the country— in defiance of public sentiment, they point to a legal technicality in justification of their persistence. This simply resolves itself into an "I *will* or I wont." And what are to be the consequences? Disastrous every way.

First. A long and sore litigation between them on the one hand and Dr. Gould and his associates on the other. They force these gentlemen to such a test of their rights. Litigation of a personal character, in all probability, will likewise take place. Mrs. Dudley, too, will, beyond doubt, call Mr. Olcott to account, who at the time acted as *her* trustee as well as trustee of the Observatory, for using without her authority, and misapplying her donation of $50,000 and the securities in which it stood, *before* the condition on which the donation was based had been complied with. The Scientific Council are to speak in answer to the "Statement." Dr. Gould is likewise preparing his own *defence*. Where will the controversy end? Mere possession of the Observatory on the part of the Trustees will not end it. The donors will cause an investigation to be made as to what has become of the $40,000 which the nine trustees tell them has been worse than wasted. If it turn out, as it surely will, in case there is such waste, that these Trustees are, in every essential respect, responsible for the enormous loss, the competent authority can never resist and will not attempt to resist an application for their removal. Time will prove all I say. There is but one true course for these gentlemen to take, and that is to call the donors together and let them, voting in proportion to their respective donations, decide what shall be done. This would be equitable. But they will not do it, nor anything like it. "I will," governs their conduct, and that one thing will govern them to the bitter end. When the end comes, they will embitter the remainder of their days by regretting this folly. Let them understand distinctly that they mistake their men, if they suppose Dr. Gould and his friends will ever be conquered by measures like those hitherto pursued. Resistance will be the watchword to the last moment. As sure as day follows night, so surely will Dr. Gould triumphantly refute and hurl back

upon his assailants all the charges made against him. I now submit these Articles with the simple remark that I had no other motive in participating in the controversy than to aid in having justice done to an injured man.

GEO. H. THACHER.

I.

ANIMUS OF THE STATEMENT.

TO THE MAJORITY OF THE TRUSTEES OF THE DUDLEY OBSERVATORY.

GENTLEMEN: When you began your persecution against Dr. Gould, your *real* friends, who foresaw the fatal error you were about to commit, met you with argument, persuasion and kind remonstrance. You would not listen. One of your former number, Gen. Van Rensselaer, who is proverbial for his integrity and nobleness of heart, who gave the land for the Observatory, became disgusted with your proceedings, and resigned both as President and Trustee. You chose a man to take his place as Trustee, whose subserviency to certain parties is well known in this community—a man who showed his zeal in your cause by moving the dismissal of Dr. Gould, within an hour after his election as a member of your board. It is doubtful whether another man could be found in the State of New York, occupying a similar judicial office, who could possibly be induced to sully his robes by mingling in a strife so unseemly. Four of your board, gentlemen of high standing, foreseeing how ridiculous you would make yourselves appear, withheld their co-operation. Knowing the facts and the circumstances of the whole case, they would not sacrifice their reputation by participating with you in this wanton and unjust warfare. Better were it for you if the Dudley Observatory were sunk in the bottom of the ocean. The great deep would then bury in oblivion that unenviable immortality which the perpetuation of the institution will attach to your names. Should it survive, even in your hands, and continue after your death, future generations will read with astonishment the narrative of the unworthy

part you have acted during the last few months of its his tory. Review with me for a little, the renowned document you have published, and which you are pleased to call your "Statement;" a document which, one year hence, you will be ashamed to have named. I say one year hence, because it is fit that men, who are capable of making such a "Statement," be allowed longer time for those emotions to operate which produce shame, than other men.

1st. Read again your abusive allusions to the Hon. Erastus Corning, Gen. Van Rensselaer, and that noble lady, Mrs. Dudley. What bearing has your abuse of these persons on the matter in controversy between you and Dr. Gould? None whatever. It was most wanton and malignant. Will high-minded and honorable men be likely to espouse your cause, when, under pretence of stating facts to justify your removal of Dr. Gould, you deliberately travel out of your path to heap abuse on other parties? You accuse Mr. Corning of "repudiation." If your accusation were true, does that justify your removal of Dr. Gould? Mr. Corning is too well known, both at home and abroad, to be affected by so vile a slander. The same is true in regard to your insinuation against Gen. Van Rensselaer. According to your statement, Gen. Van. Rensselaer, instead of receiving the laudations which you yourselves showered upon him, when he gave the grounds for the Observatory, ought to have been a mark for the pointings of unnumbered fingers of scorn. For you *now* insinuate that he did, what you *then* applauded as an act of noble generosity, from the miserly and sordid motive of enhancing the value of his surrounding property. Mrs. Dudley, God bless her good and noble heart! really supposed, when bestowing her princely donations, that she was doing a meritorious act—that she was conferring a lasting benefit on mankind—and unwittingly indulged herself in the gratifying reflection. But according to your statement, not to Mrs. Dudley, but to Thos. W. Olcott, is due whatever there

is of merit in her princely gift. You boast that Mr. Olcott, "and he *alone*," procured these donations from Mrs. Dudley. Mr. Olcott must have the credit, and Mrs. Dudley be content with the claim of a mere heartless formality. Nor does this suffice. You must embitter the declining years of this aged lady by proclaiming to the world that she cannot comprehend her own letters, and that she acts a false part in allowing them to be called hers. She dictated those letters herself, and, before attaching her signature, took counsel of a high functionary of our State government. She took this wise precaution, not because she doubted her own capacity, but because she knew the character of the men with whom she had to deal. She had discovered their craftiness. She proposed a course to you, which, had you followed it, would have saved the Observatory from ruin, and yourselves from disgrace. For that kind act of hers, you publish and send far and wide over the land a "Statement" which contains insinuations tending to depreciate her capacity, and impliedly impeach her veracity. Had your own mothers been thus treated and thus assailed, neither of you would deserve the name of *son* till you had inflicted summary chastisement upon the aggressor. For the future, gentlemen, if you have no respect for yourselves, be entreated to regard the feelings of this aged lady. In case you cannot feel the common promptings of humanity, take my advice, and, by all means, counterfeit them, should you have occasion to allude to her again. This kind of hypocrisy the world will overlook. Let her end her noble life in peace.

2d. Consider the use you have made of Dr. Gould's letters. You have presented these letters in your "Statement," for the purpose of casting dishonor upon Dr. Gould. For the present we will *assume* that your extracts from them are correct, and your inferences just. You *know* that many of these letters were written to individuals, and were marked by the writer either with the word "*Private*" or

"*Confidential.*" This you have not denied, and will not, and *dare not* deny it. Among all civilized nations, such a bare-faced betrayal of confidence, as you have exhibited in the publication of these letters, is held to be treason to society. The person who is guilty of so base an act forfeits all claim to the confidence of mankind. Every man asks himself, "Whose turn will come next? What guaranty have I that I will not be betrayed?" No man is safe. Fear may restrain some of your fellow-citizens, who, like Dr. Gould, have written *confidential* letters to you, from an open reprobation of the disgraceful act, because they, too, are in your power; but no man who walks on the face of God's foot-stool, not excepting your own ostensible friends, will fail to despise from his inmost soul this glaring violation of all that is sacred in private friendship. Hereafter, all prudent men will talk with you in monosyllables if possible, and none will dare to commit to paper even a monosyllable, and entrust it to your possession, unless he be willing to have it proclaimed on the housetops. Do you wish to be treated by those to whom *you* have written confidential letters as you have treated Dr. Gould? In this case, too, I give you one whole year for that revulsion of feeling which will overwhelm you with shame, and for the reason before stated. By that time, the cautious reserve with which all prudent men will hold intercourse with you, will open your eyes to a realization of that distrust which must become universal.

Reflect now upon your attitude before the public with respect to the *import* of these letters. According to your statement and your asseverations since, those letters have not been changed by you, and their import remains the same to this day. Some of them were written in 1855,, some in 1856, and some in 1857. These are facts stated by you. Very well. These letters were in your pockets all this time. Yet with them in your pockets, you make a lion of Dr. Gould—you make select parties in honor of him at

your own houses—you take him and introduce him to our first families—you exhaust the vocabulary of praise in speaking of him and bewail the barrenness of the English language, because you cannot find words to express your admiration. You told us he was a marvel in point of scientific attainments, and all that constituted social and moral worth. In Albany this is notorious. Every child knows it. Still these *horrid letters* were in your pockets. You read them before you went to bed—took them from under your pillows in the morning, read them again and placed them in your pockets, and carried them about with you during the day. For the space of three years this was going on, and the import of these dishonorable letters remained undiscovered. Or, if you had discovered their import, you practised a despicable imposition on the community and the friends and donors of the Dudley Observatory. You did not stop with these uninterrupted ovations in honor of Dr. Gould. On the 19th of January, 1858, your board passed resolutions endorsing all he had done up to that time, and praising him in unmeasured terms. You continue on in blissful ignorance of the import of these villainous letters till about the month of June, 1858. Then you discover for the first time, though they had absorbed your studious attention for nearly three years, that they were infamous on their very face, and ought to consign their author to universal scorn. If they are infamous now, they were when written. One of three things is certain. Either you have grossly perverted those letters, or you deceived the public and the donors of the Observatory by suppressing them until this late hour, or you show an utter incapacity to control and direct this trust. There is no escaping one or the other of these conclusions. Which will you take? *Assuming* your "Statement" to be *true*, one of them is inevitable.

But in a communication published in the *Atlas & Argus* of Sept. 20th, 1858, to which your names are attached, you enter, to an important extent, a cognovit to the charge of

garbling and perverting Dr. Gould's letters. You there say, "It is true that in some instances large portions of letters of very great length have been omitted, merely for the sake of brevity." So, you did not garble, but you omitted "large portions" of his letters. Do you know what "garble" means? You preferred not to let the letters speak for themselves, but to cull out such portions as suited your purpose. In that communication you likewise say that, "here and there a word has been accidentally changed." When you condemn a man by his own words, what right have you to take the liberty of changing a single word? Your protest that these changes do not affect their meaning amounts to nothing. Are *you* to be the judges? Dr. Gould will show that these changes do, and that seriously, affect their meaning. Replying to your communication in the same paper and same date, Dr. Gould says:

Under these circumstances I desire to submit the following questions to the judgment of some impartial tribunal:

1. Whether the Statement of the nine Trustees does not contain extracts from letters essentially private and unofficial?

2. Whether it does not contain portions of letters which were actually marked with the words "Private" or "Confidential."

3. Whether any of these letters prior to January, 1858, were addressed, either to the Trustees, or to any of their officers in their official capacity?

4. What proportion of the extracts were published correctly?

5. Whether my meaning has not been perverted?

6. Whether alterations, omissions and additions, prejudicial to me, or favorable to the case of the Trustees, have not been made?

7. Whether sentences not actually written by me have not been published?

I can see no better means of attaining the desired end than the following:

If Messrs. Olcott, Harris and Armsby, with their associates, will name two impartial men, and place the original letters in their hands, I will also name two and submit my letter books. These four gentlemen shall select a fifth and proceed to compare the passages cited with the original letters and with their press-copies, since any comparison which does not embrace these fac-similes would be manifestly unjust. The committee shall report distinctly upon the seven points above enumerated. I will abide the issue.

All men will pronounce this proposition a fair one. Gentlemen, you *dare not accede to it.* Nor can you evade the

charge by publishing the letters in full. That would not relieve you from the odium already incurred by your garbling them in your "Statement." Let the *fact* that you praised Dr. Gould daily for three years, with these letters in your pockets, and that on the 19th of January last, you formally endorsed by resolutions his scientific and moral character, let these *facts* interpret the *animus* which actuated you in presenting these letters to the public in the shape you have chosen. These *facts* forever estop you from giving them as evidence against him. If your object is self-conviction you have effectually accomplished it. Dr. Gould needs no other vindication.

Here is an example of your own perversion of Dr. Gould's letters. On page 149 of your "Statement" you represent Dr. Gould as having given a written approval of the name "Olcott Comet." You quote from his letter thus: "it was a very pretty idea to give the Comet the esteemed name of the excellent Mr. Olcott." Why did you not quote *all* his words on that subject and let the public know precisely what he did say? What he wrote was as follows: "It is a pretty idea to give to the Comet the honored name of the excellent man. *But since it is contrary to all my theoretical principles to designate the comet otherwise than by its year and number, you must so arrange it that I do not appear responsible for it. I am willing to play dissembler a little in the matter.*" The words italicised above you have left out. You *knew* perfectly well that the letter from which you quote, for you say you have the original, gave you no authority whatever for stating that he approved of the name. Specimens of similar perversions can be given, sufficient to fill a volume, and all equally palpable.

3. You deny that your President, Mr. Olcott, made the charge of peculation against Dr. Gould. Let the public judge. Here is Mr, Olcott's language:

"This discloses the fact, which now, for the first time, comes to our knowledge, that not the Coast Survey, but Dr. Gould, individually, pockets, in addition to his salary, the very considerable income from longitude deter-

minations. This truly solves a problem and explains his past anxiety to grasp the legislative appropriation."

Now take Webster's definition of peculation: "Peculation—The act of defrauding the public by appropriating to one's own use the money or goods entrusted to one's care." If Mr. Olcott's charge, as set forth in his own language above, does not accord with Webster's definition of *peculation*, will any mortal man tell us what it does mean? Did the legislative appropriation belong to Dr. Gould? Not at all. To "individually pocket" the State appropriation, as Mr. Olcott says he attempted to do, is peculation of the blackest dye. Yet Mr. Olcott insists that the "fact" that Dr. Gould "individually pockets, in addition to his salary, the very considerable income," &c., "*truly explains*" his attempt to pocket the "legislative appropriation."

If this "*fact*" truly "explains" Dr. Gould's alleged attempt to peculate from the legislative appropriation, it is and must be because the *two acts are identical in their nature.* Otherwise, the former is no explanation of the latter, and human language is utterly devoid of meaning. Our courts and juries have repeatedly convicted persons of libel on language less explicit than the language of Mr. Olcott, and the world has applauded the verdict.

It is known that the late "Statement" of the majority of the trustees was revised by a distinguished lawyer, and this may account for Mr. Olcott's anxiety to deny in that "Statement" that he had made the charge. It is also known that the charge, as originally made, is to this day publicly circulated, and with Mr. Olcott's knowledge. He is still willing to continue the circulation of the charge, while he denies that he made it. Let him take the consequences. It is noticed here as another illustration of the animus of your "Statement." Dr. Gould will take care of the legal bearings of the charge.

Who is Dr. Gould? He is a man in the prime of life. From his school-boy days he has toiled hard and unceasingly to earn a name. Distinguished gentlemen in the Old

and New World—the learned and the great—have already placed that name side by side with their own on the glorious catalogue of scientific celebrities. With proud satisfaction they have welcomed him to an equal standing with themselves. All that he has on earth that is dear to him—yea, dearer than life—is that well-earned name. What some of you strive to acquire through the agency of money, and the *power* it gives, *he* has acquired by the energies of his noble mind. This you would take from him. You would brand him as a thief—as a man who "*individually pockets*" what does not belong to him. Has human character no sacredness in your eyes? Why then this cruel accusation? Yet he has the melancholy consolation of being only one of several victims. As previously shown, not satisfied with this attempt to blacken the character of Dr. Gould, you have aimed your poisoned arrows at the other persons I have named. To one of your number, at least, may be appropriately applied Dr. Young's celebrated apostrophe to the Angel of Death:

"Insatiate Archer! could not one suffice!"

4th. Of a piece with your other statements, is the imputation of deliberate falsehood to Dr. Gould in regard to the "Corning Clock." After quoting from his speech at the Inauguration on the 28th of August, 1856, these words, "*even as the Corning Clock now ticks above my head*," you say:

"It required great boldness, and a most unenviable indifference to truth, to enable any man to make such a statement, in the presence of such an audience. That the deception might be the more complete, the speaker, when he alluded to the 'Corning Clock,' turned significantly to a clock exhibited by Mr. Gavit, upon the rear of the platform."

Gentlemen, if Dr. Gould, with "great boldness" and "with a most unenviable indifference to truth," told a deliberate lie to that vast assembly, *you* knew it *then* as well as you know it *now*. You connived at the falsehood then—have done so since. During the intervening time you held him up before the eyes of your fellow-citizens as a pattern

of excellence. On the 19th of January, 1858, fifteen months after the Inauguration, you gave your formal sanction, by resolution of your Board, to the character of Dr. Gould, and surrendered the Observatory to his charge. All this you show in your *own* "Statement." In the name of all that is respectable on earth, let me ask, has every spark of shame forsaken you? You have made out a case against yourselves, if your Statement be true, that must forever degrade you in the eyes of mankind. Indeed, I am tempted to take back my allowance of one year from this time, as the probable period when a realization of your conduct will produce in your minds the first emotion of shame. When deliberate, mature manhood is capable of self-abasement like this, we may well conclude that shame is out of the question.

Now for the facts in relation to the alleged falsehood of Dr. Gould. At the *very moment* when Dr. Gould utterred the language you quote, at the very moment when he "turned significantly to a clock exhibited by Mr. Gavit," (not a clock, but a dial,) at that moment the clock for civil time *was* ticking in the Observatory and its tick was indicated by telegraphic communication between it and the dial held up before the audience by Mr. Gavit. On the tablet was inscribed the name of *Erastus Corning*, as the giver, and the inscription was on it at that moment. The public will be astounded to learn that Erastus Corning's name had been inscribed on the tablet of that clock *before* the Inauguration, by the *express direction* of Dr. Armsby, one of your number, and that it has remained there to this very day. You *knew* it at the time of the Inauguration—you knew it when you wrote and signed your "Statement."

It is in vain for you to resort to the subterfuge that a *portion* of Mr. Corning's subscriptions was to be applied to the purchase of a *sidereal clock*. The *fact* is before the world, that there was a Corning Clock at *that time* ticking in the Observatory. That *fact* was a *sufficient* justification

of Dr. Gould's language. Who, then, is the liar in this case? Gentlemen, this *gem* from your "Statement" cannot fail to do you infinite credit among all who read this controversy. Wear it, gentlemen, for wear it you *must*. Though, if you prefer to turn the other side of this gem to the world, and let men see, that if Dr. Gould *did* lie, *you connived at it*, you are at liberty to present it in that aspect.

All your tirade about extraordinary and useless expenditures and delay, is answered by the simple *fact* that you yourselves directed and controlled everything. You have been repeatedly challenged to produce a financial account of these expenditures, with the *vouchers for the items*. The Scientific Council, the donors to the Observatory, and the public have asked you for it. You will not produce it. It is known in Albany, that if you do this *truly* and *justly*, you will disclose evidences of your own most miserable mismanagement, that no sophistry or jesuitical pleading whatever can gainsay or resist. All you complain of, that is worthy of notice, occurred *previously* to January of this year. Yet in that month you *praise* Dr. Gould, and make him the Director of the Observatory. You effectually answer your own statement by your own acknowledgement of this *fact*. Whatever delay has occurred has originated from two causes. One is the fact that the parties with whom contracts were made by your direction for certain instruments have failed to get them ready at the appointed time. For this you find fault with Dr. Gould. The other is, that you have not furnished the funds which the Scientific Council expressly stated to you at the outset would be necessary to equip and endow such an Observatory as you proposed to erect. You made the Scientific Council believe that the "measure of your liberality," and that of others, would rise to the requirements of a first-class institution. In this you signally failed. Still you exacted brick, though you refused them straw. They must answer your highest expectations, while you failed to furnish the means you had

promised. "For which of you intending to build a tower, sitteth not down and counteth the cost, whether he have sufficient to finish it? Lest haply after he hath laid the foundation, and is not able to finish it, all that behold it begin to mock him." Will the tower which you have erected stand as a monument of your folly? In case you gain possession of it, it must so remain. *You* can never complete it on the plan you have contemplated. For you have effectually severed yourselves from that class of influences from which alone the "material aid" as well as the moral must come. There is, therefore, nothing for you to gain by this contest but the bare possible victory of *possession*, and that is a victory which has no spoils but an uncompleted "tower."

We know here in Albany what you conceal from people abroad, viz: that you now give up what before you esteemed as your important positions, and fall back on the subterfuge that Dr. Gould and the other members of the Scientific Council are retaining possession of the Observatory in defiance of your legal rights. The truth can be stated in a few words. You made a fair bargain with these parties, in virtue of which you have placed the Observatory under their charge. Now, finding you cannot succeed in making the public believe your "cock and bull" stories about Dr. Gould and his associates, you strive to create the impression that they retain their possession in defiance of right. They were induced by *you* to come here, at great expense to themselves. They came, and now you complain because they have thus far fulfilled their agreement. Do you intend to "repudiate" the contract? You do well to accuse others of repudiation.

Doubtless these gentlemen would long ere this have relinquished possession of the Observatory, had you treated them properly. But you *forced* them to the attitude of defence. When the rupture began, they came on here with purposes of conciliation. But they found that you had made public charges against Dr. Gould, which, if unrebutted,

must ruin him forever. They asked you to hear him and let him vindicate his cause. You denied the hearing. They then proposed to leave the matter to the arbitrament of any impartial men that might be selected. This you refused. Then you turned and attacked the other members of the Scientific Council with the same bitterness. Meantime the donors of the Observatory became alarmed. They besought the members of the Scientific Council to adhere to the contract made with you and retain possession.. In the circumstances there was no other alternative left. I only express the common sentiment of this community, when I tell the reader that the great misfortune to the Observatory—the one which has probably given rise to all this trouble—was the discovery of the "Olcott Comet." Had the ill-omened visiter passed by our city unseen, Dr. Gould's "incapacity" his "indifference to truth," his "wasteful expenditures," his "individually pocketing" money that did not belong to him, &c., would, in the opinion of the writer, and in the opinion of those who know the *undisclosed* portion of the controversy, have likewise remained undiscovered. It all goes to show the mischievous power of personal ambition. The public history of the controversy also shows how the power to wield money will bind men together—how it can bring the press to contribute to the unworthy ends sought to be attained. But, thank heaven, truth is more mighty than personal ambition, or the accidental power which the control of money confers. The truth will come out. By the power of truth you will be met—by its tremendous resistlessness you will in the end be discomfited.

It is just that I here give my reason for not signing my proper name to this article. Albany has been my residence for many years; it was the residence of my father and grandfather, more than fifty years ago. My reason, then, for not signing my name is, that, being so familiar with Albany, I know the unrelenting vindictiveness with which some of your number pursue those who cross your path.

ALBANY.

II.

CURIOSITIES OF THE STATEMENT.

GENTLEMEN: There are some curiosities connected with your late "Statement," which, though they have impressed outsiders with great force, may have escaped your notice. To some of these allow me to direct your attention.

On page 24 of your Statement, you sum up the grievances complained of in the *preceding pages*, and picture in glowing language, the sad regrets and gloomy realizations which oppressed your spirits at the time of the Inauguration, August 28, 1856. That the reader may judge how you felt, I quote your own language, see page 24, as follows:

"It brought with it, it is true, some reasons for sadness. It came with hopes unfulfilled, and expectations disappointed. Of all the splendid promises made by Dr. Gould, and the brilliant visions which he had kept before their eyes, *not a single one was realized.* No Transit, no Meridian Circle, nor any other instrument attracted the admiration of the scientific world. No marvelously constructed clock, noiselessly recorded the accurate passage of time, as it was chimed forth from the 'belfries of the skies.' No 'time ball' fell in the great commercial emporium. No bond of ever acting sympathy, linked together the clocks of Rochester, Buffalo, Troy and Albany. No railroad station exhibited to the scientific members, on their way, any evidence that the trains upon which they traveled, were deriving their time from the Dudley Observatory. The Observatory itself had the appearance of a ruin. The walls of both wings were open to receive the piers and capstones, and to permit the working of the 'Ingenious Crane,' or as it might more properly be called, the Automaton Mason. Instead of leading their distinguished visitors up the hill, to spread before them the glories of the model instruments, the efforts of the Trustees were directed towards keeping them within the limits of the Capitol, and the large tent, and inducing them to forget the deficiency of the *real*, in the brilliancy of the *fanciful*."

More than twelve months after this, just before the rupture began, your President, Mr. Olcott, writes to Dr. Gould thus:

"All we have done and are doing is for American science and we are disposed to be governed altogether by our Scientific Council. We have unbounded confidence in them in everything, and we wish them to consider us as an humble instrument in their hands in carrying forward this great enter-

prise. We have not a personal wish, object or interest in this matter. We are willing to sink or swim, with a Henry, a Peirce, a Bache and a Gould, as the only chance of immortalizing ourselves in this world."

After the experience of some six thousand years, our race have adopted the axiom that *truth* is always *consistent* with itself. Look at the two pictures. In August, 1856, you fully realized the terrible calamities you complained of in the first twenty-four pages of your Statement. More than one year *after* this, you are, according to the letter of your President, Mr. Olcott, "disposed to be governed *altogether* by our (your) Scientific Council." He says, "we have *unbounded* confidence in them in *everything*, and wish them to consider us as an humble instrument in their hands, of carrying forward this great enterprise." Indeed, your ecstacy is irrepressible, for Mr. Olcott adds: "We are willing to *sink* or *swim* with a Henry, a Peirce, a Bache, and a *Gould*, as the *only chance* of *immortalizing* ourselves in this world!!" Philosophers regard these *contradictory* statements as uncommon phenomena of the human mind. They are amazed, nay, astounded at these singular developments. No mental or moral philosophy, ever yet written, can account for them. At this time, August 28th, 1856, Dr. *Gould* told that monstrous lie, as you allege, respecting the Corning Clock. *Twelve months* afterwards, Mr. Olcott says: "We are willing to *sink* or *swim* with a Henry, a Peirce, a Bache *and a Gould!*" History, written or unwritten, may be safely challenged to produce a similar specimen of the *moral sublime*. To think that Thos. W. Olcott—a man who has for a long life been connected with a Bank that has succeeded so well, and has not "sunk" with certain other banks that *did not succeed* so well—to think that such a man, with his co-Trustees, is "willing to '*sink*' with a Gould!"—this passes human comprehension.

Gentlemen, is it really true, that as far back as August 28th, 1856—"Of all the splendid promises made by Dr. Gould, and the brilliant visions, which he had kept before

your eyes, *not one was realized ?"* Did even the "Observatory itself have the appearance of a ruin" in consequence of his neglect? Did "No transit—no Meridian circle—no marvellously constructed clock—no 'time-ball'—no railroad station—no bond of ever-acting sympathy"—and no sundry other things, exhibit traces of Dr. Gould's skill and faithfulness? Why then, more than one year after this, and when you were on the threshold of this controversy, did your President write to Dr. Gould: "We are willing to sink or swim with a *Gould*, as the only chance of immortalizing ourselves?" Simple-minded people would take this as a joke, were it not that on the 19th of January last, you formally placed the Observatory under the charge of this Dr. Gould. With the gravity of the Roman Senate, you resolved on that occasion, that you "most gratefully *recognize the valuable* co-operation of the Scientific Council," of which Dr. Gould was a member. You also include Dr. Gould as one of the names "so *illustrious* in science." See page 68 of your Statement.

Had we any evidence that when your President wrote that letter, and he and you passed these resolutions, your minds were slightly elevated with an extra sip of wine, we could turn the matter off as an act of pleasantry on your part. Most men will excuse facetious infirmities whatever their origin. But we cannot excuse you on this ground, for we know you are not given to wine. No, we must believe you were really serious on both these occasions. Notwithstanding all your intense sufferings, inflicted upon you by Dr. Gould, and so graphically described on page 24 of your Statement—sufferings which culminated on the 28th of August, 1856, in almost absolute torture—you go on with him for more than twelve months, experiencing in the mean time, numerous inflictions equally terrible, your President *then* sits down and writes to him—"We are willing to *sink* or *swim* with a *Gould* as the *only chance* of *immortalizing* ourselves in this world!" This happy state of mind con-

tinues through the month of January, 1858, for in the latter part of that month, you verify your willingness to "sink or swim with a Gould," by passing resolutions highly complimentary to him, and formally placed him in charge of the Observatory. Gentlemen, this letter of your President and this action of your board, furnish a full and complete answer to your 173 pages of charges against Dr. Gould. *Every one* of these charges, excepting that relating to the quarrel got up by Robert H. Pruyn and Dr. Armsby, with Dr. Gould's assistants, in which the former were clearly in the wrong, is based on events that transpired *before* your President wrote that letter, and your board passed these resolutions. What does all this prove? It demonstates beyond all possibility of contradiction that all these charges were *after-thoughts* on your part. It shows that they were manufactured and trumped up for the occasion.

When the writer commenced this article, it was his intention to take up these charges, scattered through the 173 pages of your ponderous Statement, one by one, and after stating each, place along side of it, *its own refutation*, in the words of your President, uttered on the eve of the controversy: "We are willing to sink or swim with a *Gould*," and the further refutation contained in your resolution of the 19th of January, 1858, in which you praise him, and by the terms of which you place the Observatory under his charge. In the light of these *stubborn facts* you stand convicted before the world, of grossly perverting Dr. Gould's letters. With these letters in your pockets, you write to their author, "We are wiliing to sink with a *Gould*"! In the light of these *stubborn facts*, you give the lie to all you have said about his "incompetency"—his "indifference to truth," and all the other provocations of which you complain. In the light of these *stubborn facts* the public can find the *true* solution of your gratuitous persecution of Dr. Gould. They can see that the *real* cause is not what you set forth in your "Statement."

In a letter of your President, written to a member of the Scientific Council on the 19th of December last, he says, "If driven from our association with you, we shall be upon the ocean without a star to guide, or compass to direct our course." Gentlemen, you have severed yourselves from your Scientific Council, and you *are now* "upon the ocean without a star to guide" you. The only luminary in the broad expanse of the universe, which looms out before *your* eyes, is not a "star," but the "Olcott Comet." Captivated with this delusive object, you have followed its erratic course, till it has led you far out upon the "ocean." There you are bewildered and confused. In that ocean there lies imbedded, deep and firm, a mighty rock. Its huge form rises high and frowning above the billows—that rock is the rock of *truth*.

The Olcott Comet is decoying the miserable craft on which you float, directly towards that rock, and soon the tempest of public opinion, which is sure to rise, will contribute to the violence with which it will approach and be dashed to fragments. Then, gentlemen, there will be a "*sinking*" but no "*swimming*;" and a "sinking," too, without a "*Gould*." Your disastrous fate is inevitable, unless you turn again and hail the "star," in whose guidance, on the 19th of December, you wisely reposed your hopes.

Gentlemen, in attempting to crush Dr. Gould, you have counted without your host. He has friends whose resources and weight of character are fully equal to yours. They will meet you undaunted, and contest every point. They *know* they are right. You may send out your "Statement" by the millions, instead of thousands. We rejoice at it, because you thereby make the reaction, which is sure to bury you beneath its overwhelming wave, the more widespread and sweeping. For once, you will find that the dollar is not "almighty"—in your hands. As to the assumed *weight* of your *nine* names, what is it compared

with the names arrayed against you? We specify the following:

NEW YORK.

Wm. Oothout,
Sun Mutual Ins. Co.,
James Brown,
R. Withers,
Atlantic Mutual Ins. Co.
Meredith Howland,
J. C. Green,
Goodhue & Co.,
Robert B. Minturn,
E. & G. W. Blunt,
H. Chauncey,
C. Barstow,
Mortimer Livingston,
Wm. T. Cary,
Wm. B. Astor,
Solomon Townsend,
A. C. Richards,
Howes & Co.,

BOSTON.

Edward Everett,
M. Wigglesworth,
J. Wigglesworth,
B. A. Gould,
Martin Brimmer,
J. B. Lincoln,
Nathaniel Thayer.

ALBANY.

Blandina Dudley,
S. Van Rensselaer,
M. T. Reynolds,
A. M. Strong,
John Taylor,
Erastus Corning,
Eliphalet Wickes,
F. Townsend,
J. V. L. Pruyn,
Gilbert C. Davidson.
Joel Rathbone,
Ezra P. Prentice,

and the other donors, who represent more than three-fourths of the amount contributed to the Dudley Observatory.

Add to these the names of the committee of citizens, viz:

D. D. Barnard,
J. B. Plumb,
James Edwards,
Dr. Thomas Hun,
Orlando Meads,
Dr. Mason F. Cogswell,
Gen. John Tayler Cooper,
Isaac Vanderpoel,
H. Pumpelly.

Will not this array of names at least counterpoise those of your immortal *nine?* If not, we will add four other names, which you, in your resolutions of the 19th of

January last, pronounced "so illustrious in Science." They are those alluded to, in a letter of your President to Dr. Gould—"We are willing to sink or swim with a Henry a Peirce, a Bache, and a Gould, as the *only chance* of immortalizing ourselves in this world"!

ALBANY.

III.

DR. GOULD'S "INCOMPETENCY."

GENTLEMEN: Your so called "Statement" is replete with "unfolding glories"—glories that will adorn your reputations through all time. On the eve of this controversy, you seemed to be casting about you for some opportune occasion by means of which you could attach "immortality"—to your names. In your own estimation at least, your case was apparently desperate. But a happy thought struck your President. His quick eye saw at a glance, *one* more chance—alas "the *only chance.*" Overjoyed at the discovery, he hastens to his desk, and from his nimble pen, flow these memorable words:—"We are willing to sink or swim with a Henry, a Peirce, a Bache, *and a Gould*, as the *only chance* of immortalizing ourselves in this world"! With his usual rapid discernment, he saw that his long sought for immortalization could be acquired by connecting himself with "a Gould," and in no case would he forsake the Doctor because this was his "*only chance.*" At his time of life, and considering the manifold disappointments that had thwarted his aspirations for an immortalization of his name, no one will dispute the wisdom of his choice. A few months roll around, and this "illustrious" Dr. Gould,—this forlorn—this "*only* CHANCE," stands before him a quack astronomer—an incompetent man! Not that this was a sudden discovery. Oh, no. According to your "State-

ment," you found that out as far back as the Inauguration, August 28, 1856. For you tell us that when the Inauguration took place, "It came with hopes unfulfilled and expectations disappointed. Of all the splendid promises made by Dr. Gould, and the brilliant visions he had kept before their (your) eyes, *not a* SINGLE *one* was realised." The *italics* are your own. Poor patient souls! Conscious that he had treated you so shabbily, you then, as all our citizens know, paraded him before our eyes as the wonderful Dr. Gould! Judging from the way you acted on that occasion, a stranger would have expressed no surprise, had he seen you go before him, and strew flowers in his path. So adroitly did you *conceal* the deep chagrin which you *now* tell us you *then* felt. Day after day, week after week, and month after month pass by, and this man, as you tell us in your "Statement," continues to demonstrate to your entire satisfaction, his "incompetency"—he proves to you by unmistakable evidences, that he was, to use your own words, "*utterly unsuited* to the position he had occupied." Ignoramus and imposter as he was, after the lapse of twelve months of woful proofs of his "incompetency," you are "willing to sink or swim" with him. Nay, sixteen months elapse, and you place the Observatory in his hands by resolution of your board, and vote his name among the names "so illustrious in Science." But alas! for the poor Observatory! Dr. Gould, as editor of the *Astronomical Journal*, had noticed in that journal a certain Comet, as the 4th Comet of 1857, and not as the *Olcott Comet*. This proof of his "incompetency" precipitated matters to a crisis. Measures must now be taken to remove him from his post. Soon your President comes out with a public proclamation of his "incompetency." No longer could this "unfolding glory" be concealed from the world. Edward Everett, who, in his masterly oration on the day of the Inauguration, *vouched* for Dr. Gould's competency—who spoke of him "as a man to whose distinguished talent has been added the advan-

tage of a thorough scientific education in the most renowned universities of Europe," and who "has *shown himself to be fully qualified* for the high trust,"—Mr. Everett must now be told that he then and there stated an untruth, and that Dr. Gould is not competent for the "high trust." Encke, Gauss, Airy, Arago, Struve, Hansen, Schumaker, Peters—not *the* Peters who was formerly Dr. Gould's assistant but Peters the great astronomer of Altona, and other distinguished astronomers, with whom Dr. Gould had prosecuted his studies, and who were proud to enroll his name with theirs, as a worthy, practical astronomer—they must now be told that they, too, are incompetent to judge of Dr. Gould's competency, and have imposed upon the world by giving their high sanction to his astronomical qualifications. Professsors Peirce, Bache and Henry, who at the outset staked their reputation on the competency of Dr. Gould, are now informed that the Doctor is an ignoramus, and that their reputation is forfeited. Astronomers of Europe, astronomers of America, the learned men of the world, who have chosen this man as a deserving member of their scientific associations—all, all are wrong. Dr. Gould is incompetent! Mr. Olcott, whose vision seldom expands beyond the circumference of a dollar, boldly pits his "opinion" against the opinion of those who have swung the telescope and measured the stars, for half a century. This is the man who now pronounces on Dr. Gould's competency, not with "surprising assurance," for we are not suprised at any amount of assurance he may exhibit.

But there are the stone piers and the "Ingenious Crane?" Don't they prove Dr. Gould's "incompetency?" Let us see. What was the purpose of those piers? They were to sustain instruments which required the nicest possible adjustment, instruments which were to perform the most precise and delicate measurements. An error arising from the awkward and hasty placing of the instruments, though

the error were no more than the thousandth part of an inch, at the point of starting, by extending the line of observation to a far distant object in the heavens, would introduce wide uncertainty and confusion into all the calculations based upon it. You seem to think that a stone mason with a few timbers and crow-bars and log-chains and a dozen brawny arms to assist, could have taken these piers and placed them in position in a few hours, and would call anything more than this "transcendental exactness." Let the mason then throw a little mud into the joints and chinks and all is ready. Gentlemen, Dr. Gould is not the man you take him to be, if you suppose he would risk his own future reputation and that of the Observatory, on the hasty placing of these piers by the rough hands of the stone mason. Had he done this, as you think he ought to have done it, then indeed, he would have demonstrated his "incompetency." That, whereof you accuse him, is the *strongest possible* evidence in his favor.

Dr. Gould's colleagues well describe the value of the "*Ingenious Crane.*" They say, "the apparatus for placing the great piers, by which the meridian circle is supported, we consider as being at once ingenious, economical and well-contrived. The success with which it has accomplished its work is the best demonstration of its excellence. Stones weighing over seven tons each, were to be brought into place with a degree of accuracy with which an ordinary mason could not lay even a brick or corner stone. To talk of placing them properly, without some such apparatus, is to utter ridiculous absurdity; and this case well illustrates the many practical difficulties with which Dr. Gould has had to contend, in his successful efforts to grapple with the difficult problem of mounting an instrument of such unexampled magnitude and delicacy." You were ready to shout "Hurrah, boys, seize your crow-bars, watch the timbers, and heave away! Does it bind—does it hit? Knock off a corner! Hold, take the sledge! Poke it with a bar!

There she goes! All right! Now mount the instrument and we will bring our visitors to see it." Gentlemen, I confess this language makes you appear sufficiently ridiculous. But no more so than your own conduct warrants. What do you know about these instruments? Your President, speaking of them before your Board, said, "Every astronomer, conscious of his own ability, would pant for the unfolding glories which they are expected to reveal." After being over six years connected with the Observatory, he does not know even the use of these instruments! They were not designed to discover new heavenly bodies, or develop the wonders of distant systems, and in that way to reveal unfolding glories, but simply to measure the positions of those already revealed! Yet this is the man who assumes to pronounce dogmatically on Dr. Gould's competency, and adduces his cautious precision in placing the piers and mounting the instruments as an evidence. Edward Everett pointed out to you the true office of these instruments in his oration. (See page 71 of your inauguration pamphlet.) Read this and be informed. Mr. Everett also furnishes an apt illustration of this aspect of your position toward Dr. Gould. Speaking of the persecution of Galileo by the Dominicans and Franciscans, because he had reasserted the truth of the Copernician system, Mr. Everett refers to these judges of Galileo's "competency" thus—"Good heavens! what a tribunal, what a culprit! what a crime!" When men like you pronounce judgment on the capacity of Dr. Gould, we too, may exclaim with Mr. Everett—"Good heavens! what a tribunal, what a culprit, what a crime!" Especially may we do this, since you, in your ignorance select as a "crime" what in truth demonstrates both his "competency" and his faithfulness. Galileo's persecutors were merciful compared with you. They only imprisoned their victim and put him to bodily torture. You assail a hitherto stainless reputation—brand your victim as a thief and a liar, and that he may have no redeeming quali-

ty whatever, you add to his burthen the charge of "incapacity." He came to you spotless and illustrious; you would send him away covered with infamy and hereafter to be despised. Had he yielded to your blind importunity, and placed those piers and instruments in position with the reckless haste you exacted, neither he nor you could have relied on any calculations based on their measurements. He would have rendered himself even more ridiculous in the eyes of all men of science, than you have rendered yourselves by your absurd and heedless exactions. His old astronomical friends would have scouted his calculations, and pointed with derision at both him and the Observatory. He knew that what you urged so strenuously would never answer. Manfully did he withstand your sneers and jeers. No amount of detraction and vituperation could move him from what he knew to be right. However willing you might have been to "sink" with him, he was not willing to "sink" with you.

But the Lockport stone rejected by Doctor Gould, you tell us, "other astronomers" pronounced to be good enough. Gentlemen, there is a man—Dr. Peters—whom your President eulogizes thus: "He is a gentleman, unassuming, truthful, practical and progressive. He is not a specious, entertaining, pedantic theorist, abounding in contrivances of a useless and visionary character. On the contrary, he is a ripe scholar, an accomplished astronomer, and can fathom with a profound mind the profoundest depths of science." Will *his* testimony satisfy your minds? Know, then, that *he* condemned that Lockport stone, in terms unequivocal and emphatic. His condemnation is in black and white, in a shape that admits of no denial. Not that we value his opinion more than yours. We know him well—he is a little better qualified to judge than you are. But as he seems to be, in your estimation, the greatest astronomer of the age, we offer the conclusive weight of his testimony against you. Gentlemen, I beg your pardon a thousand

times for what I am about to say, but, to use the favorite language of Judge Harris, "I feel *constrained*" to say it, and say it I must—you have made asses of yourselves in this matter. There is but one thing that sustains you for a moment. Because, forsooth, you have succeeded in mercantile and banking pursuits, people who never pause to think, jump at the conclusion that you are learned astronomers. Good Lord deliver us! All of you, but two, have been Trustees over six years, and you do not know the proper use of the instruments those piers were designed to bear. Your orator, on the day of the Inauguration, more than two years ago, devoted one head of his discourse to an explanation of their use. On the 26th day of June last, your President told you of the "unfolding glories these instruments were expected to reveal," and you then sanctioned and indorsed his remarks. You seem not to have had the most distant idea that the office of "revealing the unfolding glories" of the heavens, belonged to another class of instruments. Still you criticise Dr. Gould's mode of placing the piers and mounting the instruments. Not only so, but you discover the errors of this blundering, astronomical quack and at once pronounce him "incompetent." Well may we repeat the exclamation of Mr. Everett, "What a tribunal! What a culprit! What a crime!" Gentlemen, if the Observatory be not utterly ruined, it will not be your fault. True to his promises, Dr. Gould strove to make it a first-class institution. Hence his care in placing the piers and instruments. Excessive caution was an impossibility.

At the outset of this controversy, you did not pretend to the Scientific Council, or anybody else, that you distrusted Dr. Gould's integrity or truthfulness or competency. You based his removal solely and exclusively on the ground of a "*want of harmony*" between you and him. So you state in your official communication to the Scientific Council. What followed? Finding the community were incensed at the high-handed outrage you proposed to commit, you must seek

some justification of your course. You were in a predicament, and to get out of it, you manufactured 173 pages of charges based on events and transactions which occurred *long before* your President wrote the letter to Dr. Gould, in which he tells the Doctor that he is "willing to sink or swim" with him, and *long before* you praised him in your resolutions and made him the Director of the Observatory. For the three previous years, you had yourselves given *your unqualified sanction* to all that Dr. Gould had done. You complain of nothing of consequence that has occurred since you indorsed his entire conduct by the formal resolutions of your board. As late as the 4th of June last, Mr. Wilder, in his speech published with the speech of Mr. Olcott, addressed the following language to your board: "Dr. Gould, in his communication, lays much stress on the gratuitous services of himself and his co-laborers, and while there is *no attempt to conceal the great value* of the services they are performing, great prominence is given to the fact that they are performed gratuitously." This language, too, you all indorsed by resolution of your board. Only a few days after uttering this language, in which Mr. Olcott and you acknowledge the "great value" of Dr. Gould's services, you set yourselves at work to prove in a Statement of 173 pages, that Dr. Gould's services were of *no value* whatever! Not only so, but you insist that they were a positive detriment to the Observatory. No mind, however strongly prejudiced against Dr. Gould, can require better testimony than this fact discloses that your charge of "incompetency," and all your other charges, were *after-thoughts*. Even were these charges true, you disgrace nobody by making them more than yourselves. Granting them to be true, you show a degree of "incompetency" to manage the trust confided to you, which, compared with the alleged "incompetency" of Dr. Gould, is a thousand-fold more culpable. Strange it is that your *judicial* co-trustee did not see the ridiculous plight in which he and you were about to place yourselves

before the public. Had the learned outside lawyer, who reviewed your Statement, intended to place your *judicial friend* in this unenviable plight for the purpose of making him a laughing-stock for the profession, he took the most direct course to accomplish that object, by allowing you to publish such a Statement. It was a shrewd joke, and decidedly the best of the season. Any one who says that Nicholas Hill is not fond of fun does not know the man.

ALBANY.

IV.

GARBLINGS AND PERVERSIONS.

GENTLEMEN—Wonders never cease. "Unfolding glories" are wonders with fringes on them. To illustrate some of these wonders with fringes, I now call your attention to the subject of "Garbling." You may have heard of this subject before, but evidently you have only an indistinct conception of the "unfolding glories," which a closer scrutiny will "reveal." Be patient, gentlemen. The brilliant, dazzling light of your so-called Statement, which for a few days blurred your eyes, has passed. You should now be in a condition to reflect calmly on what has occurred. We do not despair of you. Late indications encourage us to believe that some of you begin to see things as they really are. To their friends they do not disguise that they have been misled. To the *power* on the throne of your Board, the Lord only knows what they say. Others of your *immortal nine* while they do not see with distinctness, confess that they "see men as trees walking." Only be patient and you will soon be able to tell a man from a tree without difficulty.

"To garble," means to cull out to suit a purpose. "To pervert," means to distort from its true use or end. That

you have garbled Dr. Gould's letters, in the above sense, you yourselves virtually admit in your communication in the *Atlas & Argus* of September 20th. For you there say, "*Large portions* of letters of very great length have been omitted." Pause here a moment. We have your confession of this *fact*. This of itself is sufficient to condemn you before all honorable men. Your excuse that you did it because these letters were of "very great length," affords you no palliation.

Let the reader turn to the extracts you pretend to give—let him *assume* that they are correct, (which we deny) and it is impossible for him, from the very nature of these extracts, to doubt that the omitted "large portions" would greatly modify, and in many instances absolutely change the meaning you attempt to make them convey. Nobody will dispute your right to extract a part of a letter, provided the part so given, is all that is written on a point distinct from the rest. But your pretended extracts show on their face that, if the writer penned them, he must have penned more on the *same* subject, in the *same* connection, and in the *same* letters. Instead of omitting "large portions," as you confess you did, you ought to have reversed the rule and omitted, if any, the smaller portions. Then the world could judge. As it is, your own confession condemns you. You show by your very mode of doing it, that you had a sinister object to accomplish. Because, if the partial extracts do in truth condemn Dr. Gould, then the "large portions" you say you omitted, would condemn him more. Being of the same tenor they were *important* to you, in order to make the evidence against him more convincing and more powerful. It is unaccountable that rational beings should have "large portions" of such evidence in their hands, and yet "*omit*" them, and confine themselves to the small portions. You showed no want of zeal, no deficiency in point of malignity, no mealy-mouthed delicacy, for you openly charged Dr. Gould with pecula-

tion, lying and incompetency. You could not well say more for the purpose of disgracing him. Yet, in doing this, you "omit," according to your own confession, "large portions" of the evidences on which you rely to condemn him! Will Judge Harris tell you that complainants in his court are accustomed to *omit* "*large portions*" of the evidences on which they rely to establish their complaints? He confesses that he does so, out of court, but does he tell you that such is the practice of lawyers when he is on the bench? The truth is, you blundered when you made that confession. You should have made a total denial and braved it out to the last. Many people would have believed you then. But now, even your friends falter, and the great mass of the community have lost all confidence in your statements, based on these letters. Like a horse in the mire, the more you flounder the deeper you "sink," —but you don't "sink—with a Gould." What your "Statement" and your confession plainly disclose, viz: that Dr. Gould's letters have been garbled and shamefully perverted, will now be established beyond all doubt by a few examples.

Take first the specimen I noticed in a former communication, in relation to the Olcott Comet. On page 149 of your Statement, in order to show that Dr. Gould at first approved the name, Olcott Comet, you quote these words from one of his letters—"It was a very pretty idea to give the Comet the esteemed name of the excellent Mr. Olcott." In the original letter and immediately following this are the words which you "omitted," viz: "But since it is "contrary to all my theoretical principles to designate the "Comet otherwise than by its year and number—you must "so arrange it that I do not appear responsible for it. I "am willing to play dissembler a little in the matter."

You quote *seventeen* words to show that Dr. Gould approved of the name, and omit *forty-five* words which in the original *immediately* follow the seventeen, and which ex-

press in the plainest possible language, his positive disapproval. The words *before* the "*but*," are convenient for your purpose—the forty-five words after it utterly disclaim the very thing you want to prove, and these you deliberately omit. The *forty-five* words which contain the gist of the pretended extract, are a specimen of the "large portions," which you confess you "omitted."

SPECIMEN No. 2.—On page 18 of your Statement, you tell us that Dr. Gould had the plans for the enlargement of the two wings of the Observatory building prepared under his direction and subject to his approval. Then you quote from a letter which he wrote the day following April 23d 1856; *i. e.* April 24th, thus—"the plan for changing the building—that is, altering the *two* wings—is satisfactory and very handsome." Let the reader observe carefully what I now say about this extract Either some one else or yourselves, have boldly inserted *nine* words—one word for each majority Trustee—which words *are not* in the press copy of the original letter. The words not contained in the press copy are these—☞ *that is altering the two wings is satisfactory and*—☜. What was the *motive* for inserting these words? The word "*satisfactory*" is inserted to make people believe that Dr. Gould pronounced the plan "*satisfactory*." He says no such thing. What did he say? You shall have the extract as it ought to have been made, leaving out the inserted words. "The plan for changing the building seems very handsome, *but then will arise that everlastingly tormenting question which haunts us all through life*—$?" Another motive for inserting all the *nine* words, was to intimate that Dr. Gould *lied* when he said that the *west* wing was torn down without his approbation.

By inserting the words ☞—the *two* wings—☜ he is adroitly made to give the lie to what he had said on another occasion.

But there is another unfolding glory connected with this pretended extract. Only a *part* of the sentence is quoted. The garbler, whoever he is, as usual, quotes till he butts his

head against the word "but," and then he stops. Dr. Gould finishes the sentence by saying—"*but* then will arise that everlastingly tormenting question which haunts us all through life—$?" Had the garbler completed the sentence it would have proved the *reverse* of what he desired. The grand predominant motive, both for the garbling and the insertion of the *nine* words, was evidently to make Dr. Gould responsible for the acts of the Trustees. But Dr. Gould plainly intimates to you that the question of—"$?" (dollars?) was a serious obstacle—a serious objection, and throws the responsibility where it belongs But all this part of the sentence is left out. As to the insertion of the *nine* words not in the press-copy, by what term shall I designate such an act? Shall I call it "moral forgery"? Perhaps Judge Harris can suggest a more appropriate term. An indignant community will form their own conclusion.

Let this community not forget, that, after the garbler had omitted a "large portion" of a pretended sentence, it did not then suit his purpose, and *nine* new words were actually fabricated and inserted.

Specimen No. 3. On page 20 of your Statement, after a remark about "experimental chronographs," there is the following pretended quotation:

"I was more sanguine of their brilliant success, a fortnight ago, than I am now; but while we are trying experiments, we take care to put a peg through all that we have already secured."

This differs in a most remarkable particular from the press-copy. Where the word "*experiments*" occurs in the above, the press-copy has the words "*to progress.*" Let the reader now substitute the words "to progress" in the place of "experiments," and he will have the extract as it *ought* to have been made. Here is a positive change of words from what the press-copy shows. Had it been correctly given the extract would read "we are trying *to progress*," not "trying experiments." It was deemed by the garbler important to make the public believe that Dr. Gould had been guilty of wasting the money of the Trustees in vision-

ary "experiments." In order to do this, the words "to progress," as they appear in the press-copy, are changed by inserting in their places the word "experiments." Is this one of the accidental changes referred to in your communication of Sept. 20th, in the *Atlas & Argus ?* You say in that communication "here and there a word has been *accidentally changed.*" What a happy accident! It was just the thing for the purpose in view. Ah! you are lucky men. It falls in with your design and enables you to prove that Dr. Gould was spending your money in "trying experiments." Here let me note another point which you have confessed, viz: that "here and there a word has been accidentally changed." Gentlemen, when you attempt to condemn a man by his words, you were bound by all that is high and holy, and great and good—by all the ties which link together the brotherhood of honorable men—you were bound to see to it, that changes of words were not made. There is no excuse for you. Your confession on this point ought to condemn you without one item of other evidence. If you keep on, we shall soon have a nice chapter of confessions. You confessed that your former charge of peculation against Dr. Gould was groundless—all of you, but one, confess that the charge of incompetency is likewise groundless, for in your Statement you leave Mr. Olcott alone to sustain that charge—you have confessed that you omitted "large portions" of Dr. Gould's letters—you have confessed that "here and there a word" has been changed—several of you have confessed in conversation, that you published letters that were marked private or confidential. Gentlemen, for your own sakes keep on in this good work. The confessional is your proper place. Before it you can be profitably occupied for the next twelve months.

SPECIMEN No. 4. On page 66 of your Statement, you pretend to quote from a letter of Dr. Gould—as follows:

"Doctor Peters is a man who has seen and experienced much, and I think you will like him. Born in Denmark, or rather in Schleswig, a Duchy adjoining Denmark, of which the King of Denmark is the Duke; educated

in Prussia, he was for a long time employed in the Geodetical survey of the Neapolitan Kingdom; then in Sicily during the war of the Revolution; after which he resided some years in Constantinople before coming to America. So he has had plenty of experience."

Let the reader confine his attention to the last short sentence of the above pretended extract. I will now give that sentence entire and verbatim as it is in the press-copy: "So he has plenty of *experiences to relate, and little odds and ends of wisdom,* picked up in various corners of the earth." In this case the garbler did not even wait to run against a "*but.*" He chops off the sentence in the middle—inserts the word '*had*" after "has"—converts the word "experiences" into "experience," dropping the ☞ "s," and then *omits* the words—"to relate, and little odds and ends of wisdom, picked up in various corners of the earth." The garblings and alterations are plain and palpable. What was the motive? Why, to make Dr Gould indorse Dr. Peter's *astronomical* experience! To magnify and eulogize the astronomical experience of this hero of the Trustees! In order to do this, the garbler changes "*experiences*" into "experience," inserts the word "had" after "has," and leaves out *all* the rest of the sentence!! Here is a two-fold exemplification of your confessions. "Large portions" of a sentence are left out, and words, ("*accidentally*" of course!) have been changed. Let the reader examine the extract, as I have corrected it from the press-copy, and then see what *kind* of testimony it bears in favor of the *astronomical* "experience of Dr. Peters."

Specimen No. 5. On page 35 of your Statement, you quote:

"On the 2d of March, Dr. Gould, as if still anxious to keep up the courage and confidence of the Trustees, although no apparent progress was making, writes from Cambridge, 'Everything seems to be going most satisfactorily, and hastening towards completion. I have heard from our clock, which was completed, all but the 'putting together.'"

In regard to this pretended extract, three things are worthy of notice. 1st. The press-copy has the date the 2d of June, and *not* the 2d of March. Why did the garbler

change the *date* from June to March? Why, to pave the way for the remark in the paragraph succeeding the extract, viz:

"Nearly a year and a half has since elapsed, and the clock has not yet been 'put together'!"

Now look at the extract again, and after the word "seems" place these words ☞ "*from the accounts of Dr. Peters and Mr. Smith.*" The press-copy shows that the words last given were left out by the garbler. It should read, "everything seems, *from the accounts* of Dr. Peters and Mr. Smith, to be going most satisfactorily." Had he given the quotation as the press-copy has it, it would not throw the blame on Dr. Gould, of having made "no apparent progress," but would cast the blame, if any, on Dr. Peters. Two objects must be accomplished by the garbler. The favorite, Dr. Peters, must be shielded, and the lately discovered *bad* Dr. Gould must be held up as a culprit!

Another fact in relation to this quotation is, that the second sentence is taken from the end of the letter—nearly two pages intervening—and placed in connection with a sentence at the beginning!! The body of the letter relates to other matters, and this sentence is only an incidental closing remark. By this outrageous transposition of the sentence, and connecting it with one at the beginning, the garbler is enabled to support the assertion that Dr. Gould *encouraged* the Trustees, while he was really delaying. It required this gross transposition to give coloring to this idea. In this way, a malicious person, who has a few letters written him by another, can make their author say anything he chooses. What would Judge Harris say to a man who would make such a use of another's letters, to establish a case in his court? Not *one instant* would he listen.

Gentlemen, as sure as there is a God in Heaven, the perpetrator of these atrocious wrongs, whoever he may be, will learn that divine justice "will not sleep forever." That any man, of any grade or rank in society, could be capable of such gross, deliberate, unjust, and cruel perver-

sions of another man's letters, unless it were with a worse motive than that which actuates the forger, I could not believe until my own eyes saw the evidence. The half has not been told. From my inmost soul I pity the man whose perversity of heart would prompt him to outrage a fellow being in this wanton manner. If he has any conscience left, every object he sees or touches, will be to him like the darting sting of the scorpion. Who did the wrong, I do not know, nor do I care to know. That most of you have been misled, I do not doubt. What you are to blame for is, that you have not the moral courage to tear yourselves away from those who have misled you. You owe it to yourselves and the community to disclaim all direct participation in these disgraceful acts. It is by such acts as these that Dr. Gould is to be crushed. Dr. Gould's press-copies of his letters speak for themselves. Nor can they misrepresent the originals. They show in a way that excludes all chance for doubt, that they were taken at the time they purport to have been written, and that the author, when he took them, could not have had the remotest idea, that he would ever be compelled to use them in a public controversy. They present every evidence of truthfulness and genuineness, that press books of Mr. Olcott, or any other banker, can produce.

My intention was, gentlemen, to give to the public in this letter, nine specimens, in order that the nine unfolding glories might correspond in point of number with the Trustees. There are many more in my possession, and all equally palpable, which, if I were to expose and fully illustrate, would require more than two issues of the *Atlas & Argus*, occupying all its columns.

Enough has been shown to prove beyond question, that no reliance can be placed in any of your charges based on his letters. Take all such charges from your Statement, and it has neither backbone nor ribs. It dwindles down to a tissue of mere, loose, reckless assertions. In that condition you are welcome to it. ALBANY.

V.

GARBLINGS AND PERVERSIONS.

GENTLEMEN :

> "The truth appears so naked on my side,"
> "That any purblind eye may find it out."

Yet I agree with Steele, that "it is sometimes difficult to dissipate the *illusion* to which the senses or the fancy are liable ; Fame, Glory, Wealth, Honor, have in their prospect pleasing illusions." Steele well knew the illusions which fame and *glory* hold in prospect for some men. He could comprehend the difficulty of dissipating such illusions, but an unfolding glory makes the difficulty insurmountable. Steele had never seen a glory of this kind, else he would have said that when the mind once becomes enraptured with it, no power whatever can dissipate the charm. Its victim is past recovery. That, however, which fascinates and incapacitates him, leaves ingenuous minds free to take in and appreciate truth. Some of your number, in ordinary circumstances, belong to the class last named. Your confidence in members of your board, who have misled you, has brought you into the unhappy strait of being on the wrong side of this controversy. Your secret heart already deplores the mistakes of your too confiding nature. But a wily master spirit who knew how to avail himself of this weakness, who felt it to be all important to himself to shield his crafty schemes behind the weight of your characters—hastened to get you committed in his favor, hoping, doubtless, that your *pride* of consistency, after such committal, would secure your future allegiance. Thus far, the result has verified his expectations, though it has sorely disappointed your fellow-citizens. If, therefore, I disclose to you, and urge upon your attention, the painful facts that lie before me, it is not because of unfriendliness on my part, but that I may induce you to do *yourselves* justice, by doing justice to him whom, I trust, you have unintentionally wronged. Stand no longer in the position of the

false accuser—stand no longer as a *shield* before the villainous garbler of Dr. Gould's letters. Expose the wretched creature, and partake not with him in the deep, damning disgrace. Let the world know who he is, that mankind may mark him forever.

Ponder awhile with me over a few more of these garblings Examine the following specimens—trace out the *serpentine* policy which twines itself around the statement which precedes each garbled extract, and see the forked, venomous sting, that the inference following it is made to thrust at the man whose guileless words are so cruelly distorted.

SPECIMEN No. 6. On page 131 of your Statement, in order to prove that Dr. Gould made official application to the Trustees to rebuild the Dome of the Observatory, the following pretended quotation is given:

"It (the Dome) *ought to be rebuilt.* * * * * The bad construction of the base cannot be remedied by any reasonable expenditure * * * * As I cannot altogether surrender the hope of yet seeing some equatorial instrument in the dome before long, it seems to me that $1,800 could not be better employed at the Observatory. *May I beg for your* DECISION *as early as possible?*"

Take the first sentence of the above and see how it is garbled. In the press-copy this sentence has twenty-two words. The garbler gives precisely five of the twenty-two and omits seventeen! Here it is entire, as it was originally written:

"*The truth is, it ought to be rebuilt, and the money question is the only one of weight on the other side.*"

As given by the garbler, the third sentence has thirty-two words. In the press-copy that sentence has *fifty-two words. Twenty* of the fifty-two are omitted! The garbler does not go on till he runs against a "but," as in other cases. No, it is another obstacle, one equally stubborn. What is it? It is a "*provided,*" and this "provided" is followed by the gist of the whole sentence. To leave this part of the sentence in will never do, and therefore he chops it

off. The part cut off comes in, separated only by a comma, after the word "Observatory," and is as follows:

"*Provided the means for equipment, &c., already alluded to in my letter of estimates, are not thereby to be jeoparded.*"

Here the money question, with which the Doctor began his letter, is brought out again too prominently, and therefore these words were dropped. Well, what next? Dr. Gould adds another most significant sentence immediately after the one just mentioned. What is it? "*This is the sole question.*" Thunder and Mars! exclaims the garbler, if I leave this in, my kettle of fish will be ruined. Out with it—and out it goes. Now let the reader observe how nicely the garbler has arranged the preceding part of the pretended quotation preparatory to the introduction of the concluding sentence. Having cut off from two sentences thirty-seven words—having struck out a most significant and entire sentence which followed them—all these, mind you, relating to the money question, he has prepared the quotation to suit his purpose. What purpose? Why, to show that Dr. Gould had made official application for the decision of the Trustees whether the Dome shall be rebuilt! Then follows the concluding sentence, which the garbler brings in with a flourish, thus: "*May I beg for your* DECISION *as early* as *possible.*"

The whole tenor of Dr. Gould's letter relates to *another* question, viz: the *money question.* He keeps before the Trustees the one prominent idea. Will your funds warrant the expenditure for a new dome? He tells them: "*This is the sole question.*" Then he concludes his letter by asking them to decide, what? An application for a new dome? No, this "*sole question*" as to their funds, "may I beg for your decision as early as possible?" By this outrageous and unheard-of garbling, his letter is tortured to mean another thing. Let the reader now consider the *deliberateness* with which this garbling was done. The letter was written to Thomas W. Olcott. This said Thomas W. Olcott, in an address to the Trustees, made on the

26th day of June last, had *charged* that Dr. Gould made official application for the rebuilding of the dome. The Scientific Council in their "Defence of Doctor Gould," denied that Dr. Gould's letters warranted such an assertion. With this denial of the Scientific Council before him, Mr. Olcott allows the letter of Dr. Gould to be garbled in this shameful manner, and published in its mangled and distorted form over his own signature. This is as true as Holy Writ- If Mr. Olcott will produce the *original letter*, just as it was written, it will prove the truthfulness of my exposition? Has down-right madness really seized him? Does he participate with and sanction the conduct of these garblers? Then "O my soul come not thou into their secret!"

SPECIMEN No. 7. Page 36 of your Statement has the following pretended quotation:

"I have been over-running my authority, by purchasing the Philosophical "Transactions of the Royal Society of London, from the Astor Library. I "send by this mail a draft on you for $343.75, which includes the expenses "of boxing."

Let the reader now look at the *first* sentence of this quotation as given. Let him count the words. How many are there? Twenty-one exactly, and twenty-one!! MORE, which should belong to and *form a part* of this very sentence, as *originally written*, are left out! Of the forty-two words that would compose the sentence, if properly given, the garbler takes twenty-one—*just half*—and rejects the other half. This is not an omission of "large portions" of a letter, but the actual omission of twenty-one of the forty-two words composing a *single* sentence. I will now give the whole sentence, as it should be, italicising the omitted words, and the reader can see that what I say is true.

"I have been over-running my authority, *and availing myself of an additional chance too good to be lost*, by purchasing the *series of* Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London, from the Astor Library, *at a price scarcely more than nominal.*"

In giving this I have adapted the sentence to the division made in the pretended quotation. But, in reality, the next sentence of the quotation should be connected with it by the word "and," and the whole quotation, including the eliminated words, should form one continuous sentence. Taking, however, the last sentence of the pretended quotation, as a distinct sentence, and *six more* words should be supplied, in order to make that the same as it is in the press-copy. *Twenty-seven* words, therefore, forming an essential part of this short, pretended quotation, are omitted!

Now, what was the object of the garbler? It is plain. He wishes to show that Dr. Gould transcended his authority, and purchased these books without justification. Had the garbler retained the twenty-one words which he eliminated from a single sentence, then Dr. Gould's *reasons* for making the purchase would have appeared and would have been perfectly satisfactory to the public. The omitted words tell Mr. Olcott, that the chance of making the purchase was "too good to be lost," and that they were purchased "at a price *scarcely more* than *nominal*." Besides all this, Dr. Gould tells Mr. Olcott, in this *same* letter, that the books will sell at auction for nearly twice the sum he paid.

Mr. Olcott *knew* this when he allowed this mangled quotation to be published. He knew it when he signed the "Statement," and he knows it now.

SPECIMEN No. 8. On the same page with the last, also occurs this pretended quotation:

> "We shall have to be making comparatively heavy demands upon you soon for the dome work, observing chairs, &c., &c., which are essentials."

Here again is a *single* sentence composed, as given of twenty-one words. Three of the twenty-one are fabricated by the garbler, and five that belonged to the sentence are omitted. The words ☞ *upon you soon* ☜ were fabricated and inserted. For what purpose? It was to give *force* to the false assertion of the garbler, afterwards to be

reiterated on page 131, that Dr. Gould had made official application for the rebuilding of the Dome.

We now offier the quotation as it *should be*, together with the sentence which, in the original, precedes it:

"I hope that it will not prove necessary to spend much upon grading or dressing the ground, until the tide begins to rise again. We shall be wanting to make comparatively heavy demands for the dome work; and then the observing chairs, &c., &c.,—which are essentials,"

Compare this with the garbler's quotation and mark the variations.

Consider now, Dr. Gould's *object* in writing this letter. Dr. Armsby had an absurd scheme for "sloping off the ground beautifully," &c. Dr. Gould sees that the execution of Dr. Armsby's visionary scheme would be a waste of money. To prevent this he writes this letter, and, as a *motive* to induce an abandonment of the project, he delicately intimates to Mr. Olcott that the money is needed for the dome-work. That is the long and short of the matter. Had Mr. Olcott taken this advice, $800 or $900 would have been saved. As it turned out, that money was wasted, as Mr. Olcott and Dr. Armsby both know. This garbled and partially fabricated quotation was adduced to represent Dr. Gould as urging reckless and extravagant expenditures. To do this, the sentence which precedes and *explains* it is omitted, and five words are omitted in the sentence quoted that were in the original, and three new words inserted!! The fact was, Dr. Gould aimed to *prevent* extravagant expenditures. Yet his letters must be distorted to make him sanction them!!

Specimen No. 9. On page 28 of your Statement is a pretended quotation to show that Dr. Gould is responsible for the building and location of the dwelling house. Thus:

"As for the *location* of the house, of course *you* will judge. My views "were simply founded on personal opinion. Whatever you decide on I will "aid to the best of my abiliiy. When you ask for my opinion I give it with-"out reserve, and without any intention of taking it amiss if you decide "otherwise."

After the word "opinion" at the end of the second sentence, these words occur in the press copy, and *continue* the sentence viz: ☞ "of general principles." The object in chopping off these words from the latter part of the sentence was to make Dr. Gould express an *opinion* on the subject of the house. But the garbler reads on and finds that this omission does not *jibe* with the language of the fourth sentence. He therefore strikes out from the fourth sentence *eleven words* and substitutes five of his own! This sentence in the press copy reads:

"When you ask ☞ *me to give the results of my experience, I do it* ☜ without reserve," &c.

But the garbler *will have* the Doctor express an OPINION. The Doctor's real language will not do. So, to mend the sentence he substitutes for the foregoing eleven words, five of his own, and makes the reading thus: "When you ask ☞ for my *opinion* I give it ☜ without reserve," &c. Of course these charges are "*accidental*"!

SPECIMEN No. 10. On page 49 of your Statement, there is this pretended quotation:

"Dr. Peters was appointed in consequence of my intercession, against Prof. Bache's inclination."

As this sentence was originally written, it should be read:

"Dr. Peters was appointed in consequence of my intercession, against Prof. Bache's inclination, *and stationed at the Dudley Obseevatory upon my application.*"

Nine words of this sentence—one again for each majority Trustee—it will be seen are omitted. Why was this done? Because they exposed the base ingratitude of Dr. Peters towards Dr. Gould, who had made him what he is in this country, and more than he will ever be again.

So effectually had this garbler caught the garbling itch that he garbles even Brunnow's letter and the letters of Prof. Bache. Take Brunnow's letter, page 163, as Specimen No 11. The last sentence of Brunnow's letter is given thus:

"I also regret that this has chilled the friendly feelings I had towards you since our first acquaintance."

Now I will give the sentence complete as Brunnow wrote it:

'I also regret that this has chilled the friendly feelings I had towards you since our first acquaintance, *and especially since I was received so kindly at your house when I first arrived in this country.*

Such a tribute as these words of Brunnow's convey, to the noble and generous qualities of Dr. Gould's heart, must not be allowed to see the light! To prevent even an incidental item of justice to be done to the man who is to be crushed, eighteen of the thirty-six words, just half, are eliminated from the closing sentence of Brunnow's letter. Here is a case where Dr. Gould has the original letter, and you the copy.

One of Prof Bache's letters is horribly mangled. See it on page 46 of your Statement. We offer this as

SPECIMEN No. 12. Take the *fourth* sentence as given by the garbler. Thus:—"Nevertheless, I cannot reproach myself with any want of frankness." From this sentence, as shown by the copy, *forty-one* words are omitted! Here it is in full:—

"Nevertheless, I cannot reproach myself with any want of frankness *in stating to you, when consulted, the extent of endowment necessary for a first class institution such as you and all concerned in it desire to found and such as would be worthy of the director you have in view.*"

The forty-one words in italics were omitted. Now, what was the motive here? It was three-fold—1st, Let it be borne in mind that Prof Bache had *warned* Mr. Olcott over and over again that a *sufficient* endowment was an indispensable prerequisite to the success of the Observatory. This declaration of Prof. Bache, is one of the hinges on which the whole controversy turns. Hence, if the sentence under consideration had been given *entire*, just as Prof. Bache wrote it, it would have told most powerfully against Mr. Olcott on this point. 2nd. By omitting this

part of the sentence, it leaves the reader to infer that, while Prof. Bache says he has always been *frank*, he has in fact been disengenuous. 3rd. By leaving out these words it helps the garbler to convict Prof. Bache of petulence and fault-finding. But the fifth sentence of this pretended quotation shows altogether a *new* species of garbling. I will now repeat the sentence—"We have all labored disinterestedly and with some energy, *you* most emphatically so." Would the reader believe it? Well, by the change of *three letters* in the word before and the one after "emphatically," the meaning of the whole sentence is changed from what was written. Look back now at the *last three* words of the sentence. For the word M-O-S-T read "m-u-s-t" and for the word "s-o," read "s-a-y." When you have done this you have these words just as they should be and just as Prof. Bache wrote them!! The separation of the letters of the words is made by me to bring out distinctly the alterations.

A single glance shows the object of this. By changing m-u-s-t into m-o-s-t, and s-a-y into s-o, Prof. Bache is made to say to Mr. Olcott:

"*You* most emphatically so;" *i. e.* you, Mr. Olcott, have labored *disinterestedly*, "*most emphatically so*" *!!!*

Whereas, what Prof. Bache really *did* say, was—"We have all labored disinterestedly, and with some energy, you *must emphatically say*." And who are the "*we*"? Obviously the Scientific Council are intended. Instead of that, the idea of Prof. Bache is made by the garbler to turn a complete summerset and compliment Mr. Olcott! No wonder Prof. Bache was thunder-struck when he came to read this garbled sentence in your "Statement." He was unaware that he had given this compliment to Mr. Olcott. When he looked at his copy, sure enough the alteration was palpable. Need I characterize this kind of garbling? Oh! yes, it was one of the wonderful "accidents"! Did ever a "Statement" of a 173 pages before this exhibit such a chapter of "accidents"?

In the sentence next following the one last considered, one word, the adjective "just," is omitted, and three other words are transposed from their regular place to another part of the sentence. For this the only rational motive is, that, in case the garbling of the words "must" and "say" should be detected and pointed out, the garbler could instance these changes as *an evidence* that the conversion of "*must*" into "most" and "say" into "so" was *really accidental.* He can then say what motive had I for the changes in the one case? There being no plain or obvious motive, he can further say, "Oh, the truth is I was careless in both cases—I did not mean it—it was *accidental.*"

I could go on with eight or ten more articles giving further specimens and illustrations of garblings just as palpable as those already noticed. On page 36 alone, of your Statement, five pretended quotations are cited, containing in all, one hundred and twelve words. *Thirty-seven* words that belonged to, and were a part of the sentences, and absolutely essential to the true meaning, are omitted, and five newly fabricated words have been inserted. My heart sickens at the sight, and therefore at present I forbear further exposures.

These pretended quotations pertain to letters about the wings of the Observatory—the dome work—the house—the clocks—the instruments—the books—Dr. Peters, &c. In every instance the pretended quotation, when corrected, proves *directly the reverse* of what the garbler desires.

A mortifying *fact* is that most of these letters were received by Mr. Olcott and Dr. Armsby.

Much might be said about the *consistency* with which these garbled citations are used. In one place Dr. Gould is overwhelmed with citations to show that he was delaying and doing nothing. In another place they are used to show that at the *very time* he was delaying and doing nothing, he was actually cutting and slashing right and left—tearing down and putting up wings and domes, &c., &c. In one

place they are used to prove that he *lied.* In another they are used to prove that his lies were truths!!

In only one respect does the garbler exhibit real cunning. He makes these garbled extracts subordinate to one grand idea which runs through your whole Statement, viz:—to transfer from the Trustees where it truly belongs the responsibility for their wasteful expenditures and saddle it upon Dr. Gould. The garbler feels conscious that proof is wanting. Charges which he knew to be groundless were made against Dr. Gould, and he must somehow sustain them. What is to be done? Dr. Gould's letters are at hand and he grasps them with the tenacity of a drowning man. He takes them. Here he omits parts of sentences—there whole sentences—here he changes a date—there he changes entire words and substitutes others—here he seizes a sentence at the end of a letter and places it at or near the beginning—and there he transposes sentences in the body of the letter and in many instances words are fabricated and inserted. When each quotation is thus tinckered he introduces it with bold assertions and follows it with corresponding inferences. Of such material has this so-called "Statement" been manufactured.

How can such a man as Alden March—such a man as Samuel H. Ransom—such a man as William H. Dewitt—such a man as Isaac W. Vosburg—such a man as John F. Rathbone—how can either of these gentlemen walk our streets and look our citizens in the face without disavowing all direct participation in these disgraceful garblings? They can not. They are gentlemen of standing. Confiding themselves they are slow to believe evil of others and hence have been misled. Now that their own reputation is in jeopardy they cannot and will not persist in sanctioning such conduct. Knowing these gentlemen well, I predict that they will make this disavowal, and that soon. You five gentlemen have much at stake in this matter apart from the Observatory. Public sentiment cannot be braved if you justify these atrocities. As well might you attempt to

swim upwards against the plunging cataract of Niagara. You must therefore come out and disclaim personal participation in these garblings.

So far as I am concerned, I here affirm, as God is my judge, I have made these mortifying expositions solely because from the depths of my heart, I became convinced, by *evidence* that I could not doubt, that Dr. Gould was and is the victim of wrongs and persecutions unparallelled in the history of human controversy. When the truth *all* comes out and the public see it, they will say, what I know, that the half has not been told. Of this I have no more doubt than I have of my own existence. Many are slow to believe these things because they cannot understand how sensible men would do such palpable wrongs and hope to escape detection. So thought I at first. But, when it is considered that by one fell blow it was intended to *crush* Dr. Gould, and it was supposed that he had *not kept* press-copies of his letters and hence the cheat would not probably be exposed, then the mystery is unravelled. My articles have carried their own proof with them. He who runs may read.

ALBANY.

VI.

GARBLINGS AND PERVERSIONS.

GENTLEMEN:—Take the following on page 14 of your "Statement" as specimen No. 13:—

"There is no reason why all the clocks in the city should not form a circuit for themselves, independent, and be strictly sympathetic."

The garbling occurs in the omission of four words from the first line. Instead of reading—"There is no reason why," &c., read, "There is no reason *that I see now* why," &c. Mark now the *motive* in leaving out the four words in italics. What is the great aim here? The garbler had repeated over and over that Dr. Gould had made absolute

and *unqualified* promises to the Trustees, which he had not fulfilled. In the context preceding, it is stated that he had kept a "*delusive* vision" before the minds of the Trustees. But, if the qualification indicated by the four words "that I *see now*," had remained in, the reader would *see* the qualification. The Doctor must be made to give an unqualified promise. Hence this must be garbled so that he shall assert *positively* that "there *is no reason*." Afterwards the Doctor saw reasons why it was not done. The public can judge *what reasons* they were.

Look now on page 18 of the Statement and you will find specimen No. 14:

"The drawings I have been studying, and although my want of familiarity with architecture prevents me from understanding them fully, as yet, I hope to have a clear comprehension of the plan of alteration to-day."

I will now give the quotation as it ought to be—italicising the words changed by the garbler. "The drawings I have been studying, and although my want of familiarity with *architectural drawing* prevents," &c. For the words "*architectural drawing*," the garbler *substitutes* the word "architecture." Old Walton never felt more exquisite rapture in pulling a fine trout from the stream, than did our garbler when this idea popped into his mind. His sensations were glorious—*unfoldingly* glorious. "A ha!" he exclaims, "now we have the Doctor. It is important to make him *confess* by his own letter, that he knows nothing about "*architecture*." What grand proof this will be to show him up as an ignoramus. Who will believe that a man who *confesses* himself ignorant of *architecture* is fit to direct so important a matter as the building or equipment of an Observatory? Yes, we will just substitute "*architecture*" for the real words—"architectural drawing," and the thing is done! Of *course* the change was *a-c-c-i-d-e-n-t-a-l*.

On page 44 of your Statement may be found Specimen No. 15.

"If you feel so earnestly about the suspension of activity at the Observa-
"tory, it shall not be *shut up*, if I can help it. Since I saw you, both Pro-
"fessors Bache and Henry have been here, and together with Peirce, we
"have had various talks about the Observatory. We find ourselves *entirely*
"*unanimous* on the subject. But while *all* entertain the same views which
"I expressed to you, adverse to any commencement upon an inadequate
"scale, and favorable to the policy *of awaiting a new flood tide*, we yet will
"none of us *urge* the *closing up* ENTIRELY, while you feel so strongly opposed
"to it as I infer from your letter. Consequently, I feel sure that Prof.
"Bache will authorize me to keep *some* ONE of my party there."

"There will be some difficulty in finding opportunity to train Observers;
"and those already accustomed to the use of the class of astronomical in-
"struments which we ought to employ are rare in this country, as yet.
"There are some advantages in employing foreigners, but these are usually
"more than counterbalanced by corresponding evils. Furthermore, it is a
"little difficult to devise legitimate Coast Survey work, which can be done
"there without mounting the great instruments, and I would earnestly dis-
"suade from this."

To this pretended quotation I call the reader's most earnest attention.

It is a rich specimen. Fix your attention on the fourth sentence. Let me repeat it as it *should* be, italicising the words for which the garbler substitutes words of his own.

"*And* while all entertain the same views which I expressed to you REGARDING any commencement upon an inadequate scale, and *inclining to recommend* the policy of awaiting a new flood tide, *we would assuredly* none of us urge the closing up entirely," &c. Now take the garbler's version with the changes also italicised. "*But* while all entertain the same views which I expressed to you ☞ ADVERSE TO ☜ any commencement upon an inadequate scale and *favorable* to the policy of awaiting a new flood-tide, we *yet will* none of us urge the closing up entirely," &c.

Here seven words are changed and replaced by the garbler with seven of his own. Having determined to substitute ☞ *adverse to* ☜ for the word "regarding," the change of "and" into "but," and the other changes were made subservient to this. What now was the object? It was to make Dr. Gould say that he and the Scientific

Council were ☞ "*adverse to*" ☜ commencing operations at the Observatory. Inasmuch as the Doctor *does not* say so, the garbler strikes out the word "regarding," substitutes "*adverse to*" in its place, and then makes the rest of the sentence correspond by changing other words. Keep in mind reader, that the changes I here note, were made for the purpose of founding upon this garbled letter, a grave and important charge both against Dr. Gould and the Scientific Council. Before I enlarge on this point, let me notice more garbling of this letter. It relates to the last sentence which the garbler publishes in italics. I will give the sentence as it ought to be, italicising the words omitted:

"Furthermore, it is a little difficult to devise legitimate Coast Survey work, which can *now* be done there, without mounting the great instruments, and I would earnestly dissuade from this ☞ *until they can be entrusted to long experienced observers.*"

The ten italicised words were eliminated from the last sentence, because if retained, they would take off the keen edge of the previously substituted words, "adverse to," and also for the purpose of making this sentence end with a most earnest remonstrance. He quotes here not till he runs against a "but" or a "provided." What is it? An "until!" Out goes the "until," with the eight very important words which follow it. Now the quotation is prepared so that it can be turned with tremendous force against Dr. Gould and the Council. But he is not quite satisfied yet. Having horribly garbled the sentence, and so arranged it as to make it say the opposite of what the Doctor did say, the thought strikes him that it should be printed in italics. He then underscores it, and it is ready. Yes, now it is plain as the noonday sun, that Dr. Gould says unqualifiedly that he and the Scientific Council are utterly "*adverse to*" commencing operations at the Observatory. Reader, be quiet. A bomb shell has fallen into the camp of the Trustees, that is about to explode and scatter them and the Observatory to atoms.

You have no conception of their consternation. Had the "Mechanics and Farmers Bank" been on fire, Mr. Olcott's fright would have been tame compared with the agitation which had now seized him and his co-majority Trustees. Let them describe their consternation in their own graphic and exciting language, in the very words they use in commenting on this garbled quotation :

"It will not be difficult to imagine the SURPRISE and ASTONISHMENT with which the Trustees received this communication. * * * * * And they now found the men, upon whose promises and scientific counsel they had relied, anxious to "close up" the Observatory, and only consenting, upon the earnest entreaties and expostulations of the Trustees, that, as a mere show of life, some one subordinate of the Coast Survey—a door-keeper, perhaps—should be left at the Institution. They learned, too, with SURPRISE—and not without some INDIGNATION—that the instruments in which they had invested so much—and to secure which" &c.

In order to show how anxious they were to magnify their own astonishment at the reception of this letter, I will now give a sentence which followed the one they pretended to quote, and which was omitted, viz: "Still I think that these obstacles may be met and obviated; and that *you may rest easy on that score for some time to come.*" All honest men will readily endorse the assertion that "it is difficult to imagine the SURPRISE and ASTONISHMENT with which the Trustees received this communication !"

Fortunately for "all the world and the rest of mankind," the awful consternation here described, although they assert the contrary, proved to be only a passing spasm of hysterics. Reader, I will now tell you a secret. Confidentially, only between you and me. Don't for the world repeat it to anybody. Well it is this: not long after this intense consternation, Thomas W. Olcott wrote to Dr. Gould that famous letter in which he says: "We are willing to sink or swim with a Henry, a Peirce, a Bache, and a Gould, as the only chance of immortalizing ourselves in this world."

But there is another beauty connected with this pretended quotation. Bear in mind, that when Dr. Gould wrote the letter, Dr. Peters was at the Observatory. Had the garbler

retained, in the last sentence, the words—"Until they can be entrusted to long experienced observers," it might be construed to express on the part of Dr. Gould, most emphatic distrust of the astronomical experience of Dr. Peters. Therefore it would not answer to retain these words. For mind you, our skillful garbler has before him another extract, with which by the most atrocious garbling he intends to make Dr. Gould indorse Dr. Peters' astronomical experience. And he brings it in afterwards on page 66. How cruelly that is garbled is shown in specimen No. 4, previously given. The garbler has the sagacity to see that these garbled quotations must be made to harmonize with each other. Hence he chops off from the sentence the nine significant and expressive words "until they can be entrusted to long experienced observers." All these changes, too, were a-c-c-i-d-e-n-t-a-l.

I offer now a pretended extract on page 13 of your Statement, as Specimen No. 16:

"The Trustees of the Dudley Observatory, which has been erected in Albany, and is to commence its activity in August, next, (1856,) beg leave to express to your Honor, the pleasure it will afford them to furnish the city of New York with accurate time. Should the proposal meet your approbation, it would be our pride and pleasure, *from and after the day of the Inauguration of the Dudley Observatory*, to give accurate time to your city, within the fraction of a second, by the dropping of a time-ball"

This pretended quotation is introduced by the garbler thus—"And at the same time in a letter to the Mayor of New York, (☞) *Dr. Gould* said." Well, suppose the garbler did introduce it in this way? What of it? Nothing, except that the impression it is designed to convey to the reader of your Statement, is a bare-faced, out-and-out falsehood. "Dr. Gould!! said, did he? N. B. This *identical* letter was official, and signed by whom? By Stephen Van Rensselaer, President, *Thomas W. Olcott*, Vice-President, A. D. Bache and Dr. Gould, on behalf of the Council. Mr. Olcott knew this *fact* when he signed your so-called Statement, as well as he knew the way to his Bank, or as well as he formerly knew the way to the old Canal Bank.

Everything, however, must be thrown upon Dr. Gould. Dr. Gould did this thing—Dr. Gould did that thing—Dr. Gould did everything, What a horrid man Dr. Gould is! A letter which Mr. Olcott *himself* signed must be garbled of three signatures—his *own* included, in order to enable the garbler to assert that "*Dr. Gould said.*" Now here is a pretended quotation where the evidence to prove the garbling need not rest either on the original letter or on the press-copy. Mr. Olcott, himself, caused it to be *published* in the New York Papers, Feb. 14, 1856. If more evidence is wanting, I have before me a copy, endorsed as a copy, in the hand-writing of Dr. Armsby. Is not this evidence absolutely overwhelming? But the garbling does not cease with the signatures. From about the middle of the first sentence *twenty.two!* words are eliminated. From about the middle of the second sentence, thirteen more words are eliminated, making *thirty-five* words from two sentences, and these *thirty-five* words being essential to a correct appreciation of what it is alleged "*Dr. Gould* said." The words omitted from the first sentence state that "We are earnestly desirous of rendering its scientific "investigations as serviceable as may be, to the commer-"cial and material interests of the State." Do not forget reader, that these words formed an *integral* part of the sentence pretended to be quoted. They come in after the figures "1856," as above. Now mark. Inasmuch as "*Dr, Gould* said" so and so, he must not be allowed to express any desire whatever to make the "Scientific investigations of the Observatory serviceable to the commercial and material interests of the State." By no means. Was it not their great aim to show that he really had no such desire? Wasn't he acting the hypocrite all this time? "Don't for the world," reasons the garbler, "let this language go to the public, for the evident sincerity which pervades it, will convey a different impression from the one we wish. We have stated that '*Dr. Gould said,*' and how oddly it will appear to allow him to contradict, by

his *real* language, what we have garbled many of his other letters to prove—*viz:* that he felt no sincere interest in the Observatory?" With the same predominant idea in his mind, he strikes out from about the middle of the next sentence, after the word pleasure, these words—"*To contribute our share toward putting* the plan into operation." Here again the garbler reasons. "Haven't we been trying to prove, and are we not now trying to prove by our garblings that Dr. Gould and the Scientific Council are not doing their 'share?' Haven't we asserted that '*Dr. Gould said*' so and so, in behalf of himself and his associates? Now, if we permit them to state here that they will be pleased to 'contribute *our share*,' &c., will it not show the very thing we are most anxious to avoid? No, we will whittle down their language to bare naked promises, and *then* we will show that those promises were falsified."

I have not yet finished my exposure of the garbler of this letter. Readers, the last *twenty words* of this *very letter* were *fabricated!!* They are *not* in the last sentence as it was originally written—they are not in it as published in New York at the time—they are not in the copy indorsed as correct by Dr. Armsby, and which is in my possession. What was the *motive* in fabricating and inserting these twenty words! The reader will see that these words make Dr. Gould (for all this is what "*Dr. Gould said!*") absolutely promise to indicate the time to the city of New York, by "the dropping of a time-ball."

If the reader wishes to understand the object of this—if he wants a treat that is *infinitely rich*, let him turn to page 14 of the Statement. The garbler there tells us, that it was one of the "delusive visions" Dr. Gould held before the minds of the Trustees, and which they fondly but vainly hoped to see realized—that,

"When, in the eloquent language of the immortal Everett, 'the eternal sun strikes twelve at noon, and the glorious constellations far up in the everlasting belfries of the skies chime twelve at midnight"—then the *dropping time-ball* in every great city on the continent would announce at so many points on earth, what was thus chimed in the 'belfries of the skies.'"

How wonderful—what an "unfolding glory" would have dazzled the earth and gratified the visions of the Trustees, had Dr. Gould made these time-balls fall in *all* the great cities of our continent! Yet, in these *fabricated* words, Dr. Gould—for "Dr. Gould said" and promised this—holds out this "delusive vision" before them. What an immense benefit, too, it would confer on all the great cities, to have these time-balls fall at the dead hour of midnight! Imagine the sailors in the harbors, standing on the decks of their ships, the unseen "belfries of the skies" over them, and gazing into darkness to catch a glimpse of the sublime spectacle. Nor does the garbler here lose sight of this "time-ball." On page 24 it is enumerated as among the *bitter disappointments* felt by the Trustees on the day of the Inauguration that "No time-ball fell in the great commercial emporium!!"

Poor, deluded innocents. In a letter signed by Mr. Olcott, there is a promise that a certain "*plan*" should be begun and carried into effect *after* the Inauguration, yet, on the *day* of the Inauguration, it was a sore disappointment to you, as you say on page 24 of your Statement, that "No time-ball fell in the great commercial emporium." Dr. Gould,—if "Dr. Gould said" it any more than Mr. Olcott did—said what? Simply that it would be "our pride and pleasure to contribute our share toward putting the PLAN into operation from and after the day of the Inauguration." These are the precise words "Dr. Gould said," as any one can see who will examine the *New York Times* of February 14th, 1856. But our garbler has the majority Trustees in training. "Gentlemen," says he, "we must, at this point of our story, exhibit deep emotion. We must *rehearse* the loud lament which we say we exhibited on the *day* of the Inauguration, before 5000 people, when we thought how Dr. Gould had treated us." Standing in a half circle, like the *nine* muses, each of the nine Trustees raises his handkerchief to his eyes and nasally wails, "*No time-ball fell in the great commercial emporium!*" Capital!" exclaims the

garbler, "go on." Then comes a groan and the weeping *nine* add "*No bond of ever acting sympathy* linked together the clocks of Rochester, Buffalo, Troy and Albany." "Gentlemen," says their instructor, "if you will place a little more emphasis on the words Rochester, Buffalo, Troy and Albany, you will beat Garrick himself. You *must* arouse the indignation of these cities. Once more. Now for railroad stockholders, scientific gentlemen and the public generally." Agitated to the highest pitch, each handkerchief is pressed more closely, and a loud, dolorous wail ensues. "*No railroad station* exhibited to the scientific members, on their way, any evidence that the trains upon which they traveled, were deriving their time from the Dudley Observatory!" Here, overcome and exhausted, they resume their seats. But their surrounding friends, who stood aghast at this exhibition, take up the lamentation and "all Israel" is agonized with grief. By leaving out of the letter that part of it wherein "Dr. Gould said" that the "PLAN" was not to be put in operation till *after* the Inauguration, the garbler is enabled to get up this affecting scene as represented on page 24 of his Drama. Well may you say, gentlemen, that your Statement is a "Masterly Production."

In another part of the letter there was a reference to the dropping of a large, conspicuous time-ball, or giving some "*equivalent signal,*" but it did not suit the garbler's purpose.

What he *wanted* was to make Dr. Gould give certain *naked promises* about the time-ball. Accordingly in regard to these naked promises, the garbler's first comment upon the pretended quotation is as follows: "The Trustees, in *their simplicity*, believed that all this meant something." Did ever innocent creatures exhibit such "simplicity?" A letter signed by Thomas W. Olcott as one—is garbled of *three* signatures—*thirty-five words* eliminated from two sentences—twenty words fabricated, the garbled quotation is then put forth as what "Dr. Gould said," and made to convey *absolute* promises on the part of Dr. Gould!! This

is a piece of rascality which has no parallel. Oh, no! those letters have not been garbled. It was all a-c-c-i-d-e-n-t-a-l!

The letter, as published in the *New York Times*, has Thos. W. Olcott's signature as Vice-President. Dr. Armsby's copy has Stephen Van Rensselaer's signature as President. So Mr. Olcott, even at that early day, showed his anxiety to supplant Gen. Van Rensselaer. This is noticed only as another "unfolding glory."

I have before me now thirty more specimens, making with those already given, forty-six.

Let the reader now call to mind an important past event. In the face of the charge made by Dr. Gould, that the letters were garbled—with abundance of time intervening to compare the originals in their possession with the pretended extracts—in the face of all this, these majority Trustees come out before the public with a communication in the *Atlas & Argus*, Sept. 20th, ult., and unblushingly deny that the letters were garbled! Rather than be in their shoes in these circumstances, I would prefer to be far away from the habitations of honorable men.

Nothing would please me better than by some process of law, to compel the production of these original letters in a court of justice. Before that court, let Thomas W. Olcott and Dr. Armsby be summoned as witnesses, and, also, Dr. Gould with his press-copies. My choice would be that Judge *Ira Harris* should preside. After the evidence is all given, I should be curious to watch his Honor's countenance and listen to his charge to the jury. Let the reader's imagination supply the rest. I imagine that the charge would be the last straw on the camel's back to crush Dr. Gould.

No wonder you would not accede to Dr. Gould's published proposition to submit the questions of fact relating to these garblings, to five impartial men. I knew you would not do it, and so predicted and so stated in a previous article. Take now the consequences.

Gentlemen, with these exposures of your so-called Statement, Dr. Gould's friends hurl it in your face.

ALBANY.

NOTE.—Immediately after the publication of this article, the Organ of the Majority Trustees published a violent attack upon me, in which there was a most brutal allusion to my family affliction in the loss, early last summer, of an only daughter. I was also taunted with cowardice in writing under an assumed name. To this I replied and gave my name as the author of the articles signed "Albany." My intention was to have inserted that reply in its order with the other articles, but am compelled to omit it for want of space. G. H. T.

VII.

GARBLINGS AND PERVERSIONS.

GENTLEMEN:—I now continue my illustrations of Garblings by offering a pretended extract from page 16 of your "Statement" as specimen No 17.

Since I saw you, I have ordered one Chronograph and clock, and given direction for estimates and plans for two other Chronographs, the dial for the sideral and the mean time clock, the adjustment to regulate railroad and other clocks on the circuits, the observing keys and the time ball.

The first correction of the above will be to insert the words "the *Corning*" before the word "clock" in the first line. Then it will read as it *should* read, viz:—"*and the Corning clock.*" Let me now briefly explain the matter of the "Corning clock." Two kinds of clocks were desired—the one a *mean-time* clock, and the other a *sideral* clock. But, inasmuch as the sideral clock, for the purchase of which Mr. Corning's subscription was to be appropriated, would be placed *out of sight* in the Observatory, it was concluded between Dr. Gould and Dr. Armsby, that Mr. Corning's name should be inscribed on a tablet beneath the dial of the *mean-time* clock which would be *seen* by all visitors to the Observatory. Justice would thereby be done to the generosity of Mr. Corning, for his name as donor of a clock would be conspicuously displayed.

Necessity required that the sideral clock should be *concealed* from view and hence they agreed that the *mean-time* clock should bear the name and be known as the "Corning clock." Accordingly Dr. Armsby himself caused the inscription of Mr. Corning's name to be placed on a tablet beneath the dial of the mean-time clock, previously to the day of the inauguration. With this idea in his mind, Dr. Gould, on that occasion, spoke of it very properly as the "Corning clock." But now, our hero, the Garbler, has a great Statement to make. Two grand thoughts labor in his brain. One is to present Dr. Gould before the public as a monstrous liar. The other is to make it appear that the Doctor was so badly addicted to lying that he began the business as far back as the day of the inauguration. How shall he effect his object? In this way. The sideral clock was not there at the inauguration. "Now," says he, "in our Statement, we will confine the *idea* of the Corning clock to the sideral clock which has not even yet arrived." We will show, he reasons, that the sideral clock was not there, and then we will assert, on p. 27, that when Dr. Gould referred to the Corning clock as actually "ticking" on the day of the inauguration, he did it with "great boldness and an unenviable indifference to truth,"—he did it openly "in the presence of such an audience!" His plan is now all marked out, but he finds a serious obstacle in the way. Some of the letters which he intends to quote mention the *mean-time* clock as the "Corning clock," just as the Doctor spoke of it on the day of the inauguration. "Pshaw," he exclaims, what nasty business this garbling is! Well, I am in for it, so here goes." One stroke of the pen and the words ☞ "the Corning" are blotted out from before the word "clock" in the above pretended extract. To preserve the consistency of this great tale of fiction, wherever the word "Corning" appears in the Doctor's letters before the word "clock" as designating the clock for *mean-time*, the word "Corning" is eliminated, and wherever the *sideral* clock is mentioned in the State-

ment, the word "Corning" is prefixed. Here is a marked example of the "*accidentally changed*" words!

Hereafter this "masterly production" will be the chief attraction in all museums of accidents. No collection of such curiosities will be complete without it. Dr. Gould, on the day of the inauguration, told a bold and palpable lie to an audience of 5000 people. So the majority Trustees affirm in 15,000 copies of the "Statement." These majority Trustees, all of whom, if they had been at the Observatory, had seen, at the right hand of the entrance to the building, a dial of the mean-time clock with Mr. Cornings's name in large conspicuous letters on the tablet, were present and heard the great lie proclaimed. Two years afterwards the enormity of the lie was discovered. In making up the "masterly production" it *happened* that the words "the Corning" in all cases where Dr. Gould uses them in his letters to designate the *mean-time* clock are omitted; and in all cases where the *sideral* clock is mentioned in the Statement they *happened* to be prefixed! In the first line of the pretended extract above is an instance of the first kind of *happening;* an instance of the second *happening* may be seen on page 15. Stranger happenings never before happened since man was created. Nevertheless they have actually *happened* in numerous instances in this wonderful, this "masterly production!"

From the last sentence of the above pretended extract, *twelve* words have been severed which immediately follow the last word of the sentence. They are: "Or what may perhaps be even better, the *falling of four arms.*" In this as in the New York letter already noticed, and in other letters of Dr. Gould where he connects "falling arms" with "falling time-balls," the "falling arms" are kept back from the reader. The object is to impart force to the great ado, in other parts of the Statement, about Dr. Gould's imaginary promise to make "time balls" fall "in *every great city on the continent!*" All great dramatic writers strive to preserve the three unities of action, time and

place. Shall not our Garbler do the same? I can now comprehend why some of our majority Trustees enthusiastically pronounce their Statement "a masterly production."

On page 17 of your Statement find specimen No. 18.

Weigh all the names of the parties invited, carefully, in order to avoid diminishing the honor of the invitations, by affording them to second or third rate people.

This pretended quotation is given to show that Dr. Gould is an aristocrat, and that, with respect to invitations to be sent to persons, soliciting them to honor the inauguration ceremonies by their presence, he was anxious to create *invidious* distinctions among his own countrymen. It was in contemplation to publish 15,000 copies of the Trustees "Statement" and send them over all parts of the United States. Our Garbler, therefore, with a view to avail himself of the prepossessions so strongly rooted in our republican ideas, seizes this letter of Dr. Gould, eliminates a large portion of the sentence—retaining only *twenty-eight* of the *ninety-two* words which compose it, and applies the words retained, to a purpose totally foreign from the thoughts of the writer! The steamship companies had generously offered some fourteen free passes across the Atlantic to be given to distinguished scientific gentlemen in Europe, to induce them to be present at the meeting of the Scientific Association which was to be held at the same time of the inauguration. With this limited number of passes, was it not right—was it not commendable in Dr. Gould to be anxious as to the selection of proper persons to receive them? This letter was written with *sole* reference to these special invitations. I will now give the sentence as it was written, and the reader will see how well it comports with what I have stated:

It strikes me, if you in Albany approve, that besides the list of astronomers, Hall, Dana and Agassiz, as also perhaps others, such as Bache, Peirce and Gibbs, be invited to propose one or two names;—that we weigh these names carefully, to avoid diminishing the honor of the invitations by affording

them to second or third rate people also: and then draw up a neat and pretty invitation, to be issued in the name of the Local Committee, and countersigned by the officers of the association or not, as you may prefer,

Dr. Gould was General Secretary of the association, and the association was a distinct organization and in no way connected with the Observatory. Dr. Armsby was Secretary of the Local Committee at Albany. Hence he writes to Dr. Armsby to be cautious as to whom the few free passes they had should be offered.

Probably no one perversion of Dr. Gould's letters has created deeper prejudice against him or wrought him more harm than this. Nothing but diabolical malignity could have prompted or guided the intellect which concocted and carried out a perversion so obviously deliberate and wicked.

On the same page and pertaining to the same subject is specimen No. 19.

"Do not invite ——— and ——— * * * * The invitations should be select, in order to make them complimentary. A scientific man, like an artist, is sensitive; and the inviting a single man of tho wrong kind, while one of the right kind is omitted, might destroy half the charm of the whole affair. To hear that the invitation, which should be a high honor to him, had gone to Mr. Jones, or Mr. Smith, would do much harm."

The words "do not invite" are not in the press-copy at all, nor does Dr. Gould believe that he ever wrote them any where else in connection with the same thought. A horrid mutilation is here disclosed. Not only are the words "do not invite" absolutely inserted in the fore-part of this pretended extract, but the *real* words which ought to be there are taken out, a portion of them, and placed below on the *same* page of the Statement, as if they were from another letter, and used to prove another and distinct point!! The body of the extract is a mixture of parts of sentences, taken from various parts of the original letter, away from their proper context, and the words themselves mutilated or changed at that! But the result is that Dr. Gould is made to say substantially what it is pretended he said in the previous specimen in relation to invitations.

It relates like the other solely to the *fourteen* free passes across the Atlantic, and not to *Observatory* invitations, but to invitations in behalf of the American Scientifie Association! Another accident. Yes this is a "masterly production."

In order to prove that Dr. Gould "*expressed* much concern" about Gavit and Spencer having delayed their departure for Europe, the Garbler gives on the same page as a distinct quotation the following words:—

"I will not believe it possible that Spencer should not go just at the last moment. Certainly he ought not to undertake the Heliometer without having visited the European instruments, and he needs Gavit's companionship."

Correction from press-copy:

"It is too late for this to reach you before Spencer and Gavit will have sailed, for I will not believe it possible that Spencer should not go, just at the last moment. Certainly he ought not to undertake the heliometer, without having visited the European instruments. And he needs Gavit's companionship."

Dr. Gould's *real* words are any thing else but an expression of "*much concern*" as if the sending of these gentlemen were *his own* act. But the Doctor must here be displayed as *anxious* and *busy* and assuming extraordinary responsibility about Observatory matters in order to further the great aim, which is to show *afterwards*, that all his undertakings resulted in severe disappointments to the Trustees.

Let me again remind the reader that this last corrected quotation belongs to the forepart of the first quotation under this specimen. It ought to be in the place of the words "Do not invite." Further comments on the extent to which the *whole letter* has been mangled are left for the reader himself.

Another revolting instance of mutilation and perversion of a letter of Prof. Bache may be found on page 22 of your "Statement." We present it as

SPECIMEN No. 20.

"I hesitate to make suggestions to you, who have done so much, so nobly, and so wisely in this cause; but I should be recreant to the confidence you have shown in me, did I not ask you to consider *the name* of the Observatory, and all the consequences that may flow from it. The *Dudley* Observatory, at *Albany!* You will see the train of thought that these names excite, and will follow it more clearly to its consequences, with your business precision of mind."

In order to stigmatize Prof. Bache with the imputation of contemptible meanness in suggesting a change of the name of the Dudley Observatory, this pretended extract is introduced. What was the object of Prof. Bache in writing it? It was not to suggest either a change of name with respect to Mrs. Dudley, nor with respect to the city of Albany, but to suggest to Mr. Olcott the propriety of availing himself of the name *Dudley* and the name *Albany*, for the purpose of obtaining *liberal patronage* both from Mrs. Dudley and from the citizens of Albany. That was the object. But there was a rare chance here to bring Prof. Bache into contempt among our citizens. The motive was the same as in the case of Dr. Gould's letter about invitations. Well, the Garbler looks at the Professor's letter, runs his eye carefully over it, and then scowls. What is the trouble? Why there are two words in it which, if published, will thwart his purpose. They are in the third line, and are next to the word "*name.*" What are they? They are the two words ☞ "*and location.*" Accordingly he cuts them off. Had they remained, they would have shown that Prof. Bache had *no such* idea as the one the Garbler intended to attribute to him. They would have shown that his true meaning was that the *name* "Dudley," "and LOCATION" at Albany should be made use of by Mr. Olcott to obtain more liberal contributions. Had the words "*and location*" been retained, the infinite absurdity of supposing that Prof. Bache could have thought of a change of *name* and *location*, would have been apparent. For the Observatory had *then* been named, the building erected, and the *location* at Albany irrevocably fixed. The charter, too, enacted by the Legislature, had made both

the *name* and *location* absolute fixtures. Was Prof. Bache a ninny as well as a villain? Yet, assuming this construction, Mr. Olcott takes *ironical* action upon it, as the "Masterly Production" informs us, and at once carries out the idea, ironically, by obtaining an additional $50,000 from Mrs. Dudley! Pray, reader, if you want a rare and rich treat, turn to page 22 of the "Masterly Production," and ponder over its sublime comments on this letter. You will be amply paid.

On page 41 of your Statement find Specimen No. 21:

"The work upon the hill is apparently going on well. I trust that your arrangements will be as fruitful and successful as they are wisely and judiciously devised."

Here is an instance of mutilation in connection with the transposition of sentences. Corrected, the above reading should be—

"Your kind letter of the 10th was duly received, and I trust that your arrangements will be fruitful and successful as they are wisely and judiciously devised. The work upon the hill is apparently going on well, and a very few weeks ought to see everything at last completed."

Twenty-two words are, in the first place, omitted from the two sentences, and thus being suitably trimmed they are deliberately transposed. First, let me state a *fact*. Mr. Olcott had written to Dr. Gould in regard to certain "arrangements" he (Mr. Olcott) had perfected for making appeals throughout the State for subscriptions to the Observatory. Dr. Gould replies—"Your kind letter of the 10th was duly received, and I trust your arrangements will be fruitful," &c. But the Garbler has a purpose to serve. He wants to convert these "arrangements" here mentioned into "arrangements" of quite another color. He desires them to relate to the arrangements "on the hill." To effect his purpose, he first mutilates and then transposes. Now he can make Dr. Gould praise Mr. Olcott, and say that his arrangements pertaining to matters on the hill "*are wisely and judiciously devised*," and to make the eulogy more impressive he puts these words in italics! Observe again

reader, that one great aim of the "Statement," which the majority Trustees call a "masterly production," is to exculpate them from deserved reprobation foı having wasted the money of the Observatory, and to throw the blame on Dr. Gould. Hence, the Doctor is here compelled to bear witness against himself, and in their favor, and to say to Mr. Olcott that HIS "arrangements" on the hill are "WISELY AND JUDICIOUSLY DEVISED!!" Do not forget also reader, in this connection, that, after they were charged with using garbled letters, the majority Trustees, in a published communication of September 20th, most solemnly avowed to their fellow-citizens that "it is entirely untrue that Dr. Gould's meaning has, *in any case*, been perverted; that ANY alteration, omission, or addition has been made, in the SLIGHTEST DEGREE prejudicial to him or FAVORABLE to the Trustees." Their avowal remains to this day unretracted. Of all the wonders of our wide world, now known or ever yet developed in human history, no parallel to this can be produced. Does the sun shine? Do the planetary orbs still hold their places in God's creation? Are all things we see, actual existences, or are they fancies? I ask these questions because, when I look at these gentlemen, who appear to me to be the living beings I once knew—when I see them walking and moving about, in open daylight, after having made the solemn declaration to which I have referred, I begin to doubt my own eyes and my own senses. No, they are not deranged, for they still attend to their business like other men. Who will solve the mystery? Who explain why they will persist in occupying this unenviable position before the public? From thousands of voices echo answers "Who will explain?"

On page 42 of your Statement, find Specimen No. 22:

"Little notices of a few lines, conveying, each of them, some information relative to the comet, will be snapped up and run round the press, as items, when puffs would not; and it will be easy, with care, so to frame the language of a little paragraph, every two or three days, as to keep it before the public, without offending the tastes of scientific men."

I heard a distinguished Editor of our city—a gentleman who would be the last man in the world to wrong Dr. Gould knowingly—a gentleman who has suffered for some *forty* years from bitter and deliberate perversions of his own writings—I heard this gentleman criticise the above language as low, and beneath an ordinary politician, much more beneath a distinguished astronomer. My object in stating this fact, is to show how successfully these cruel distortions and perversions have been made to affect and prejudice fair minded men. Let me first correct the above garbling, and I will then state the facts as they were.

Correction, with the omitted words italicised:

"Little notices, of a few lines, conveying, each of them, some information relative to the comet, will be snapped up and run round the press as items, when *long* puffs would not. *Among those ignorant of astronomy, the detection of a comet passes for a great feat,* and it will be easy, with *a little* care, so to frame the language of a little paragraph every two or three days, as to keep it before the public without offending the tastes of scientific men."

Eighteen words, forming an essential part of the sentences pretended to be quoted, it will be seen, by comparison with the Doctor's real language, were omitted. They materially modify the sentiment, and what is more, they demonstrate the consistency of the explanatory facts I am about to state, with the true intent and meaning of Dr. Gould when he wrote the letter. A comet had been discovered. Dr. Armsby was in great glee. Like a certain domestic animal rejoicing at the sight of his master after a long absence, he bounded about and run here and there in ecstacies of joy. Where is Dr. Gould? Hurrah, Doctor, we must write splendid notices of the "Comet"—they must be heralded by the press—kept before the people—and the greatness of our exploits be talked of by "all the world and the rest of mankind." Seeing that the indiscreet enthusiast was likely to make himself ridiculous and bring the Observatory into disrepute, Dr. Gould exerted his

utmost for a time to restrain him. Failing in this, he chose the next best alternative and wrote this letter for the purpose of so modifying his contemplated imprudence that it would result in as little harm as possible. Dr. Gould, therefore, writes to him to do it in a way that will not bring the Observatory into discredit by "*offending the taste* of scientific men." My portrait of Dr. Armsby will not fail to be recognized by all Albanians as truthful and life like. Nor will any one doubt that the explanation of the circumstances connected with the writing of this letter are in every particular conformable to the facts.

On page 130 of the Statement may be found Specimen No. 23 :

Gavit will take charge of the Barometers and Thermometers home from Paris. I have written to him about it.

After the word "Paris," in the first sentence, read "if *you ask* him," and leave out from the second sentence the words "to him," which have been inserted, and then they will read as they are in the press-copy. These little corrections show at once the absurdity of the construction of Dr. Gould's language, hereby attempted. In order to illustrate the wickedness of the above, I will slightly modify and adopt the comments on the same, made by another person : "With regard to the barometers, the Garbler, in referring to the Defence of Dr. Gould, by the Scientific Council, who state that he not only did not purchase any thermometers or barometers abroad, but that he placed none in charge of Mr. Gavit to bring home, endeavors to make Dr. Gould refute this assertion by bringing him up as a witness ; and makes the following extract from one of his letters, after stating that the witness against his defenders "*shall be himself.*" In a letter to Mr. Olcott, he is represented as saying, "Gavit will take charge of the barometers and thermometers home from Paris." "I have written to him about it." Here is an attempt to fix falsehood upon the Scientific Council, by bringing a statement of Dr. Gould, that Gavit would take charge of the barometers, and that

he had arranged with him so to do, Whereas Dr. Gould, in his letters referring to the barometers, says; "I will write to Spencer, asking him to attend to it," and "Gavit will take charge of them *if you ask him.*" I will add here, what Dr. Gould avers to be the fact, that the *order* for the barometers and thermometers was given by Thomas W. Olcott. Dr. Gould also avers that what he wrote was not about orders, but about the best makers from whom to make the purchase. Is not the whole subject now made plain? Yet this mutilated quotation is used by the Garbler to convict Dr. Gould and the other members of the Council of deliberate falsehood!

Whoever our Garbler is, he is evidently conversant with the unconscious workings of the human mind. I make this observation preparatory to an illustration of my next specimen, which shall be one of the samples where a *whole letter* is perverted. As in all tales of fiction, the great actor, who in this case is Dr. Gould, must be so dressed and so introduced that the reader of the "Statement," biased by the illusions of probabilities, will unconsciously work himself into the belief that the character before him is a reality. Appreciating the value of first impressions, our Garbler artfully contrives his arrangement of the words I am about to quote, so that he will fix in the reader's mind several great falsehoods and entrap him into an assumption of them as truths. Here are the Garbler's words as found on page 10 of the Statement, and which we give as

SPECIMEN No. 24—It is the second letter to which the garbler refers in the "Statement:"

"Under date of October the 24th, he informed the Trustees that he had made a similar contract, with the same makers, for the Transit instrument."

This purports to be a concise abridgement of the letter under consideration. In the first place he insinuates that the letter was addressed to the *Trustees.* What is the fact? Neither *this* nor any other of Dr. Gould's letters pretended to be quoted were officially addressed to the Trustees. Mr. Olcott was the recipient of this letter. What motive had

the Garbler in view by insinuating that it was addressed to them? It was to decoy the reader into the *assumption* at the outset of this marvellous story, that Dr. Gould was, at the early date of October 24th, 1855, to all intents and purposes, the active managing officer of the Observatory, and that in such capacity, he *officially* addressed his letters to the Trustees. Mark how adroitly this is assumed and left to unavoidable inference on the part of the reader of the so-called Statement, not only in the specific instance under consideration, but in all the subsequent pretended quotations. Had the Garbler made the affirmation direct and explicit, the grossness of the falsehood would have destroyed its effect. For no existing fact can be more easily established than that Dr. Gould did not act either nominally or in reality in the responsible capacity of Director at that time or for a long time subsequent, nor did he address his letters officially to the Trustees. Yet the reader of the so-called Statement who, in most cases, the Garbler knew would be ignorant of the facts, is lured into the belief of a barefaced falsehood. Mark how skillfully the words are framed. He does not definitely assert that the letter *was* addressed to the Trustees, but he says, "Under date of October 24th *he* (Dr. Gould,) *informed* the Trustees." If any body "informed" the Trustees it was Mr. Olcott, to whom the letter was addressed. But another and far different inference, the Garbler well knew would be drawn by most readers of his vaunted "Statement." In accordance with the same leading idea, Dr. Gould is represented as if he had made a "contract," or as the Garbler calls it a "similar contract." Similar to what? Why to the contract for the Meridian Circle mentioned in the preceding context, which he was authorized by the Trustees to purchase, not under a general authorization as an active officially appointed Director, but under specific instructions. Judge how "similar" the two contracts were, when I state the *fact*, that the latter contract was for a Transit instrument for Prof. Bache of the Coast Sur-

vey. It was not purchased as the *property* of the Observatory at all. The Trustees do not own, nor have they owned to this day, a Transit instrument of any kind. This brings us to another great object the Garbler had in view. The subject matter of the letter relates to aT ransit instrument, but which he calls THE Transit instrument. He designs to represent the Trustees as having an interest in this "Similar Contract"—Doctor Gould as acting with a view to their interest in making the contract, and in that capacity as purchasing THE Transit instrument afterwards to be spoken of at length on page 133 of the "Statement." Let the reader turn to page 133 and read as follows:

"That it was *the* instrument agreed to be furnished by Prof. Bache is sufficiently evident from the fact that a room in the Observatory was prepared for it at a cost of several thousand dollars; that it is now, and has been for a year and a half past, at the Observatory; and that the freight and charges upon it, amounting to about $300, have been paid by the Trustees.

It still remains packed up in the boxes in which it arrived from Europe!"

Here is a grave charge made; and to prepare the way and form a basis for the charge, Dr. Gould's letter of October 24, 1855 is referred to as shown. Mr. Olcott shall now have the pleasure of seeing himself furnish a contradiction to the assertion cited from page 133 of his Statement. In Mr. Olcott's speech before the board of Trustees June 26th 1858, page 13, he explains the case for Dr. Gould and Prof. Bache, by quoting Prof. Bache's letter of September 29th 1855, in which the Professor says—"I will provide from the *coast survey instruments* a Transit for time &c." Nothing can be plainer than that he meant a Transit instrument from those *then owned* and in use by the Coast Survey. Prof. Bache fulfilled his pledge. He sent forward the instrument as agreed, but this was not "*the* Transit instrument" Dr. Gould ordered in Europe for Prof. Bache, and to which, the Garbler, by introducing this letter, endeavors to make it refer. Prof. Bache does not say I will provide *the* Transit instrument Dr. Gould will order for me, but I will provide from the instruments of

the Coast Survey *a* Transit for time &c."—meaning from the instruments then on hand. The *facts* that the other instrument was not then in existence nor expected to be for a long time, and that Prof. B. *fulfilled* his pledge by sending forward as agreed, "a Transit for time," conclusively point out the real instrument intended. But by a gross perversion of the letter of October 24th, 1855, it is adduced as a *basis* on which to found several charges against Dr. Gould and the Scientific Council. 1st. That they did not fulfill their pledge. 2d. That they lied in affirming that they had fulfilled it. 3d. That they were guilty of culpable neglect and delay in not mounting the instrument. The new Transit was sent to the Observatory by Prof. Bache, not in fulfillment of his pledge contained in his letter of September 29th, 1855, but in *addition* to that pledge and without being under obligation to send it. The reasons why it has not been mounted are, 1st, that the practical operations of the Observatory itself do not yet require it. 2d, that to mount it now would incur an expense the Observatory is in no condition to bear. Yet the majority Trustees came out with indignant accusations all based on the letter of October 24th, 1855, the sense of which the Garbler pretends to concentrate in the few words quoted above. No ordinary intellect could arrange twenty-five words and form out of them such a vile nest of vile falsehoods.

But the Garbler desires not only to represent Dr. Gould as at this time addressing letters to the Trustees officially, but as actually exercising powers and authority which they themselves boast on page 146 of their Statement that they never offered to him till January 1858! and also to display him before the reader as hindering and delaying operations at the Observatory. The imagination of a Milton would lack ability to frame language adequate to depict the wickedness of this perversion. But the Garbler has borrowed the tailor's shears, and with it he is determind to cut out a paper coat from Dr. Gould's letters in

which the Doctor must be arrayed, and, at t
paraded before the readers of his so-called "Statement." Then he proceeds and tacks on patch after patch of these mutilated quotations till his victim's appearance becomes absolutely hideous. Having done the ignoble service, he chuckles with fiendish delight, while the leading majority Trustees hold up their hands with feigned horror at the sight of the frightful image before them.

Need I say more? Need I now review these wanton garblings, mutilations and perversions, and show with what crafty skill they are turned against Dr. Gould and made to substantiate the various charges preferred? Need I ask the reader whether he can resist the conclusion that charges attempted to be proven by *such witnesses* are and must be utterly baseless? All other conclusions are excluded by the nature of things, by the facts disclosed, and by the God-made constitution of the human mind.

Who will now accuse me of undue severity in characterizing these atrocious outrages as I have in these Articles? "If any; speak! for him have I offended."

ALBANY.

VIII.

GARBLINGS AND PERVERSIONS.

Gentlemen—There is a bare possibility, though the probabilities are ten thousand to one to the contrary, that there may be some crooked or excentric intellect in which some doubt may yet remain, both as to the fact and the motive of these falsifications. To meet such a case, if there be one, I will add another specimen which rests on other evidences than original letters or press copies; evidences which all can handle with their own hands and see with their own eyes—They are to be found by simply comparing Dr. Gould's speeches as published and sanctioned by the Trustees in their first Inauguration pamphlet, and

the pretended quotation from that speech on page 26 of the "Statement." I will give the quotation as it is in the "Statement," and as Specimen No. 25:

"The great Dudley Heliometer, (for which Mrs. Dudley who had so munificently raised her $6,000 to $8,000, has now raised the $8,000 to $14,000,) is to be built by our countryman Spencer, here, in this city of Albany. Ladies and gentlemen, let me assure you, here in the presence of these five thousand witnesses, on this solemn occasion, with the full sense of the responsibility before the whole scientific world which the declaration entails, let me say to you, that the Trustees of the Dudley Observatory will never regret it."

The first word of this quotation is taken from nearly the centre of a sentence, and is given as if it began a new one. I will now repeat the whole of the first sentence as it was originally uttered, and will italicise the words omitted, to the point where the garbler breaks in and pretends to quote:

"*Knowing the splendid triumphs of German and French mechanic art, knowing the exalted reputation that most worthily adorns Repsold's name—the Trustees of the Dudley Observatory have yet confided the construction of this exquisitely delicate instrument to our countryman, and* the great Dudley Heliometer, (for which Mrs. Dudley, who has so munificently raised her $6000 to $8000, has now raised the $8000 to $14,500) is to be built by our countryman, Spencer, in this city of Albany." The reader will not fail to see in the omitted words, that Dr. Gould asserted on that occasion not that *he* but the *Trustees* had taken upon themselves the responsibility of employing Spencer to make the Heliometer. This language was published and sanctioned by the Trustees at the time, and never was contradicted by any one till nearly two years afterwards, and that was when the Garbler found it necessary to mutilate the quotation as above described. Having done this he introduces it by asserting that "He (Dr. Gould) spoke of the Heliometer [☞] *he* had ordered from Spencer in the following terms." He tells us that the "*following terms*" were Dr.

Gould's words, whereas he had cut off *forty words* from the first sentence he pretended to quote! He tells us that Dr. Gould "ordered" the Heliometer, and then omits from that first sentence the part of it in which the Doctor says ☞ "the TRUSTEES *of the Dudley Observatory have yet con-confided the construction* of this exquisitely delicate instrument to our countryman!" Then in the unsophisticated innocency of his dear heart, our Garbler, after he had given the quotation in this mangled form, goes on and comments upon it thus:—

"Still the Trustees have the comforting assurance of Dr. Gould, with the full sense of his reponsibility before the whole scientific world, that they will never regret *the order he gave to the intended maker.*"

The few words I have here italicised, show how anxious he was to make the falsification impressive. To do so he reiterates his introductory assertion. Another object in omitting the forty words from the first sentence was that they contradicted what had been already stated on page 15 of the "Statement." Dr. Gould had there been represented as announcing to a meeting at Mrs. Dudley's, that he had ordered the Heliometer from Spencer. Of course, if the Garbler had retained the omitted words all his labored attemps to prove, and his assertions to the effect that Dr. Gould had taken the sole responsibility in the matter, would have been abortive. All the facts pertaining to Dr. Gould's connection with Spencer in relation to the Heliometer, will soon be made public. I will, however, say here, that Dr. Armsby was the means of getting the contract for Spencer, and it was one of the few meritorious acts into which he blundered. It was a favorite project of Dr. Armsby to have Spencer remove from Canastota to Albany, and establish his manufactory here on a more extended scale. He solicited the writer of this and many other citizens of Albany, to take an interest in the contemplated establishment. The day previous to the meeting at Mrs. Dudley's, Dr. Gould, at Dr. Armsby's request, went with him and visited Spencer at Canastota,

and Spencer came with them to Albany. This was the *first time* Dr. Gould and Spencer ever met. During that and the day following, the two held long conversations on Observatory instruments, and the interview resulted in Dr. Gould's becoming perfectly satisfied as to Spencer's ability and attainments. Spencer returned home on the 6 o'clock train of the evening of the meeting at Mrs. Dudley's. But Dr. Gould had not then even intimated to him in any way whatever, that he was to have the contract for the Heliometer, nor did he expect it. "The award was a complete surprise to Mr. Spencer, a surprise enhanced by the fact that in several conversations between Dr. Armsby and Mr. Spencer, the former had *expressed regret* that Dr. Gould was *so fixed* in his conviction respecting the construction of the instrument by Repsold."

The foregoing are Spencer's own words, from a statement of his now before me. Dr. Armsby was the pivot on which the whole transaction turned. Dr. Gould's entire action was simply a cordial approval of the plan after he had made suitable investigations, and a warm co-operation with the Trustees in carrying it into effect. Every essential item of responsibility pertaining to the contract was assumed by Dr. Armsby and his co-Trustees. It met Dr. Gould's approval, and he has the same high opinion of Spencer to this day; but he took no further responsibility, except to announce the award to Spencer on behalf of the Trustees. This he did, and on the day of the Inauguration he told the audience in that part of the sentence omitted by the Garbler, as above previously shown, that the "Trustees of the Dudley Observatory had *confided* the construction of this exquisitely delicate instrument to our own countryman." The Trustees, as before stated, published and sanctioned this language for nearly two years. They knew it to be true. But in order to make out their great story—in order to assert, and attempt to prove, that Dr. Gould was the only man who ever took any active responsibility, they allowed this mutilated and distorted quotation from Dr.

Gould's Inauguration speech to be published and sent forth to the world, accompanied by their solemn certificate that it is God's truth. They base upon it likewise the reiterated assertion that Dr. Gould "ordered" the instrument.

Let the reader examine the first Inauguration pamphlet and the Statement, and the comparison of what Dr. Gould actually said with what the Statement represents that he said, will appear as I have stated. When he has made the comparison, let him ask himself, what may not be expected from men who will give their sanction to such a wrong? Would the man who mangled the pretended quotation under consideration halt at any of the similar mutilations of Dr. Gould's letters? Can any one of the majority Trustees maintain his standing in this or any other community and yet justify the outrage? Will the five, or perhaps six, of these Trustees who have been entrapped into a sanction of these proceedings by signing the "Statement," and the card of the 20th September, still presume upon retaining the confidence of their fellow citizens unless they first disclaim all participation in or approval of them? Gentlemen, in all seriousness let me tell you it is an impossibility. The more you hesitate and temporize, the worse it will be. Reports from ex-parte committees cannot save you from the disgrace. But you can relieve yourselves from it by a bold and manly disclaimer. That you will make in the end, whatever course you may pursue now. Dr. Gould and his friends will follow you up and insist upon a fair and honest investigation of the facts. No one sided, white-washing committee, will ever satisfy them, or the public, much less your own consciences. Your present attitude before the public cannot be maintained without serious injury to your reputations. It will do very well for the three leading Trustees to declare before heaven and earth that two and two are five, and insist upon public acquiescence in the proposition, on the strength of their previous character; but it does not fall to the lot of ordinary mortals to accomplish the feat. At all events I doubt not that you will

agree with me, that the achievement, though wonderful, is neither desirable nor within your grasp. Let *them* have the honor of making the attempt, and the glory, even though it may culminate in an "unfolding glory."

Many other Specimens, gentlemen, are yet to be disclosed. For the present, however, they will be held in reserve and for a purpose. Before dismissing the above pretended quotation from Dr. Gould's Inauguration speech, let me direct your attention to another particular in which it has been mutilated. You will perceive that your "Statement" makes him say that Mrs. Dudley's contributions for the Heliometer were $14,000. Dr. Gould really stated the amount, as you will see if you look at your first Inauguration pamphlet, at $14,500. There can be no doubt that there is an object in making this change. For, in the 2d edition of your Inauguration pamphlet the $500 is there omitted from your version of his speech. Also on page 15 of your Statement you assert that the sum agreed upon was $14,000. Mr. Olcott, in his speech before your board, on the 26th of June last, states the amount at $14,000. (See page 13.)

Now Mr. Olcott's checks for the Heliometer as they appear on Mrs. Dudley's books, are as follows:

1855, August 24th, "Heliometer, ...	$6,000"
1855, September 21st, "Heliometer,.....	2,000"
1856, January 19th, "Heliometer, ...	6,500"
Total,.....	$14,500

At present I do not intend to explain what I deem to be the *real* object of this obvious misrepresentation. I allude to it here for the purpose of showing the *fact* that the amount as represented in your pretended quotation from Dr. Gould's Speech is not as your original Inauguration pamphlet had it, nor as he stated it, and also for the purpose of showing that there was a *motive* for making the change, because it is studiously carried into *three* of your other publications. Perhaps if you will scratch your heads a little, the suspicion will, after a while, creep

through your craniums that your "masterly production" may contain a few slight variations from the truth. Should this occur, you have an easy remedy. Simply fall back on your dignity—affirm by all that is sacred that two and two *are five*, and boldly deny the right of the public to question the declaration, because to do so would be equivalent to doubting whether your previous high standing is a sufficient guarranty for your truthfulness. And to doubt, in such a case, we must all acknowledge, would be intolerable presumption. ALBANY.

IX.

DR. GOULD AND THE FINANCES.

GENTLEMEN :—Whether the following dialogue actually took place between your President, Mr. Olcott, and a Donor to the Observatory, is a mooted question. Opinions differ. For my part I regard the question of but little consequence, compared with the light which the Dialogue itself throws upon the subject of your financial operations. It is enough for my purpose to suppose it to have occurred.

Mr. Olcott to Donor—Happy to see you, Sir. Step into the Bank with me and see how admirably everything is arranged. System, Sir, system ; nothing can be properly done without system. Our books all neat, accurate, and balanced to a fraction—clerks well drilled—not a farthing lost—can turn to the books in an instant and answer any question respecting our finances—hold a taut rein over all my clerks and agents, Sir ; can show a voucher for every dollar of expenditure. No financier can become great, or maintain his financial standing after he becomes so, who allows things to run at loose ends. The stockholders and the public very properly hold *him* responsible. To be successful and preserve his reputation he must see to things himself. My maxim is system, Sir—all depends on system.

Donor—Admirable ! Excellent ! Now, while I think of it, Mr. Olcott, I have been reading your Statement in relation to the wasteful manner in which Dr. Gould—

Olcott—That Dr. Gould is a very bad man—a very bad man, Sir.

Donor—So you tell us. But what I was about to say was, that he is held *responsible* for wasting our money.

Olcott—Right, Sir, right. I perceive you understand the matter.

Donor—Yes, that I understand. But there are some things in your Statement which perplex me. For example. You tell us he was not appointed Director till the 19th of January last and—

Olcott—Excuse the interruption, you touch a point of importance. That impudent creature, or rather his associates, had the audacity to say in their Defence of him that he had never accepted the Directorship till our late appointment, nor had he pledged himself to do so before the completion of the endowment. Did you notice how nicely we turn that upon him in our Statement? That Statement, Sir, is a masterly production. Allow me to read from page 146, what we say on this point: "Dr. Gould had not accepted the office of Director. *It had not been tendered to him.* He was under *no obligations* to accept it, nor were the Trustees under any obligations to confer it upon him." No, Sir, we were *too shrewd* for that.

Donor—Exactly; you gave him a capital hit. But that is what mystifies me. You say that he was not appointed to the Directorship till the 19th of January last; did not enter upon his active duties till February, and yet you hold him responsible for all these expenditures which, excepting a small amount—an amount less than the publication of your Statement has cost either yourselves or the Observatory, occurred long before January.

Olcott—Ah! but he was our adviser. Everything was done by his direction. We always consulted him.

Donor—From your previous remarks in regard to your extreme care in the management of your Bank, I should hardly suppose so eminent a financier would risk his reputation in this way. Is it customary for able financiers when they manage *trust funds* to throw the responsibility of losses on bad advisers? Were the stockholders of your Bank to be told that a heavy loss had fallen

upon them, would they excuse you on the ground that somebody gave you bad advice ?

Olcott—Do you mean to insult me, sir ?

Donor—I beg your pardon ; I meant no offence. My idea was that your financial reputation would be seriously impaired unless you can show that not you but Dr. Gould, is the responsible party.

Olcott—Havn't we shown that ? Is it not the whole drift of our Statement ?

Donor—Certainly. But then you tell us he was not Director of the Observatory till the 19th of January, and did not actively assume the office till February. All the material expenditures were made before that time. Your Statement shows this, and therefore exculpates him. It is not consistent.

Olcott—Really, sir, you seem exceedingly captious. Does not his advisory character make him responsible ?

Donor—You appear somewhat sensitive on that point. Business men will have their own opinions. There is, however, one remark I would like to make. On the 19th of January your Board, by resolutions, confirmed your previous appointment of the Scientific Council,—Dr. Gould being one of them. You state in your resolutions that the names of all these gentlemen are "illustrious in science"—that up to that time they had rendered you "valuable service," and you then formally placed the Observatory under Dr. Gould's charge. What was the "valuable service" which Dr. Gould had rendered ? Was it the wasting of the $40,000 you speak of ? Surely these resolutions were not ironical ? And if not, it seems very odd that you should tell a story of 173 pages in length to prove that, before this action of your Board, he had rendered no "valuable service"—not only so, but that his services were a positive injury. Very odd, Mr. Olcott, very odd this seems. Business men did not expect that an able, far-sighted financier could stultify himself with such an absurdity. To be plain with you, it is monstrous. Candid minds everywhere regard it as a palpable self-impeachment. It at once arouses their suspicions and they naturally look for the "cat in the meal." Shall I tell you what they say ? Well, all except your immediate friends, interpret this intricate story of

yours to be an absurd effort to make Dr. Gould a scape goat for the sins of the Trustees.

Olcott—Ah, you now throw off the mask; you belong to the enemy. Self-respect, sir, would impel me under other circumstances to end this conversation, but as you are a Donor, I will explain. Sir, the fact is we were deceived in Dr. Gould, and blindly followed his advice. That is the secret. We did not discover our error till after we appointed him Director.

Donor—Let me understand you, Mr. Olcott. Do you mean to say that you, an eminent financier, that you, through whose hands every dollar of this money passed—do you mean to say that you did not know that Dr. Gould had wasted the $40,000?

Olcott—No, sir, I don't say that exactly; because to say that would impeach my business character. What I mean is, we were deceived in the man—he had misled us.

Donor—Indeed! Well now I have the right of it. You knew he had wasted the $40,000, but with a full knowledge of the fact, you declared on the 19th of January that he had rendered you "valuable service," and you then chose him Director for an indefinite period. In fact you must have known it, for you say, on page 81 of your "Statement," that he had consumed more than this amount within the two previous years, apart from the amounts paid for observatory instruments. As the expenditures were made before January, I conclude they were the "valuable service" you praise him for in your resolutions. Very odd, Mr. Olcott; very odd.

Olcott—But you don't see the point. What has been done by his associates? They made and published a Defence of Dr. Gould, the object of which was to clear him from the responsibility. Either he or we must bear the blame. Do you suppose that gentlemen of our standing would submit quietly to the imputation of having wasted in two years over $40,000 of *trust funds*? We made our Statement in reply to their manifesto, to repel a serious imputation on ourselves. There is nothing more sacred among all "men of sense and business habits" than *trust funds*. You know perfectly well that, of all business relations, the relation of Trustee is the most sacred. It is esteemed so the world over.

Donor—"Plato, thou reasonest well." There we agree. To be a Trustee is the next thing to being the executor of a will. Quite like it in your case, for the Donors all confided their money to your care, the same as if it were a bequest. Now, "the nature of this obligation is such" that men will construe your conduct just as our courts formerly did our statute law, that is, *strictly*, they will hold you to a strict accountability. Was that the aim of the Scientific Council in their Defence of Dr. Gould? Did they hold you accountable for the expenditures?

Olcott—Precisely so, and they went to the extreme of *justifying* and *sanctioning* all Dr. Gould had done for the last three years!

Donor—Perhaps they had read your resolutions of the 19th of January. Your board on that occasion resolved that he had rendered you "valuable service," and to prove the strength of your faith in him, you then appointed him Director and surrendered the Observatory to his control. When *you* had *indorsed* and *sanctioned* all his previous doings, why do you blame the Council because they likewise exculpate him? When your own resolutions, entered on your own records, show that you sent him up to the Observatory with an expression of your approbation equivalent to "well done thou good and faithful servant," can you reproach his associates for their concurrence with you in this high compliment to his past fidelity? Very odd, Mr. Olcott, very odd.

Olcott—Sir, you will greatly oblige me if you will say less about these January resolutions. You lose sight of the point. What I said was that our "Statement" was a reply to the Defence of Dr. Gould by the Scientific Council. In their Defence they strive to convey the idea—a novel idea too, that Dr. Gould can with propriety disclaim all responsibility for the expenditures at the Observatory. Our Statement combats this novel idea with triumphant success. We had to meet it.

Donor—Thinking when I left home this morning, that I might fall in with you, I thrust into my pocket a copy of your speech before the Board on the 26th of June last. Your present remarks about this "novel idea" remind me of it. Permit me to read a few words on the 18th and 19th pages, where you say—"This was enacted at our meeting last January, on which occasion Dr.

Gould made the astonishing declaration that he (Dr. Gould) *was not responsible for any thing which had been done at the Observatory—that the improvements and alterations and erections*—I think he broadly included nearly all expenditures—had been not only against his wishes but in opposition to his expressed objections." If Dr. Gould uttered that *astonishing* declaration at your January meeting, how happened it that you recovered so speedily from your astonishment that you concluded the meeting by making him Director of the Observatory? And how, nearly five months afterwards, could you treat the declaration of the Scientific Council that Dr. Gould was not responsible for these expenditures, as a new idea? Dr. Gould was frank with you on that occasion—he was manly and above board. He told you he was not and would not be held responsible for the past, yet before you adjourned you appointed him Director! Very odd, Mr. Olcott, very odd.

Olcott—You seem possessed with that January meeting, and our January resolutions. I have several times expressed my disapprobation of your constant recurrence to them. Please read our Statement carefully and you will find something more in it than the January resolutions.

Donor—Oh, I am aware—fully aware that it contains *many other* things. My difficulty was to *reconcile* these many other things with these January resolutions. They seem to stamp all your accusations against Dr. Gould in respect to wasteful and extravagant expenditures with the brand of falsehood. By the "many other things" contained in your Statement, this man is held responsible for all this wastefulness. Of course, a financier of your ability and standing, handling every dollar of the money as you did, *must have known* all this, before the January meeting. Why then did you vote, at that meeting, that he had rendered you "valuable service?" Why did you *indorse* all he had done for the previous three years? Why, when he announced to and "astonished" you on that occasion with an explicit declaration of his innocence respecting these matters—when he told you point blank that "nearly all the expenditures had been not only *against* his wishes, but in *opposition* to his express objections"—why did you, with these words ringing in your ears, proceed to give him the highest and strongest possible pledge of confidence

which one man can give another, by appointing him Director of the Observatory? Very odd, Mr. Olcott, very odd.

Olcott—There are the January resolutions again. What pertinacity! You astonish me, Sir—you astonish me.

Donor—No doubt of it. You and I are very much alike in that respect. So far as I can judge, the Donors and the public are generally astonished. The January resolutions, viewed in connection with the "many other things" contained in your "Statement," afford grounds for the most emphatic astonishment. Very odd, Mr. Olcott, very odd.

Olcott—Once for all, Sir, I inform you of my settled determination to discontinue further conversation with you unless you dismiss these January resolutions.

Donor—Very well. Since these January resolutions are manifestly distasteful to you, please let me take your Statement a moment. There is another resolution passed by your board on the 4th of June last. Let me see—it is on page 87. You recollect it, for about that time you dismissed Dr. Gould. In that resolution you base his dismissal *solely* on difficulties "arising from *want of harmony*." When you passed this resolution you had had nearly *five months* meditation on that astonishing declaration of his, uttered with stupendous impudence at your previous *January* meeting. What strikes me as singular is that in these circumstances, with the great glaring *fact* staring you in the face, that he had wasted $40,000 of your money in the two previous years, you then placed his dismissal *solely* on the ground of a "want of harmony." Most trustees, conscious of the sacred obligations of their trusteeship, would have *insisted* that the squandered $40,000 should be accounted for. Very odd, Mr. Olcott, very odd.

Olcott—You are too sensible a man, Sir, not to know that "harmony" in such a case was impossible—*absolutely* impossible, Sir. How could gentlemen of *our* reputation harmonize with a man who had so recklessly squandered over $40,000 of our money? You surprise me, Sir. I am amazed to think that any person of ordinary capacity would broach the insinuation.

Donor—Still I am puzzled. It seems that at your meeting in January, Dr. Gould hurled in your face an indignant assevera-

tion of his innocence—he *totally denied* his responsibility, and yet you answered him by resolving that he had rendered you "*valuable service*" and by appointing him Director! Now you express the utmost surprise that I would imagine you *capable* of harmonizing with such a reckless spendthrift. With perfect knowledge of his guilt, for you say you knew it, did *you* not on that grave occasion *harmonize* with him! More surprised am I to know that you all *harmonize* with him for months afterwards. Very odd, Mr. Olcott, very odd.

Olcott—Are you a man of honor, sir? Did you not promise me, sir, that you would not throw these January resolutions in my face again? What am I to think of you? What *am* I to think of you, sir? I'm indignant.

Donor—Beg your pardon, Mr. Olcott. In my anxiety to get at the truth, I forgot my promise. Old fashioned people never place reliance on a story which manifestly contradicts itself. On page 167 of your Statement you assert that "The Trustees have thus presented what they believe to be a *fair* and *truthful* history of their connection with the *four* gentlemen who are now in possession of the Observatory." Being an old fashioned man, these January resolutions seemed to me to contradict, out and out, all else the Statement contains. To my mind. this is very odd, Mr. Olcott, very odd.

Olcott—I see, sir, it is useless to bandy words with you. You are determined not to be convinced.

Donor—By no means, Mr. Olcott, by no means. I am open to conviction. Please make allowance. Old fashioned men like me do seem queer to some people. Being a Donor, I hope you will overlook my infirmity, and that you will condescend to unravel this intricate story. Perhaps I can be of some service to you in this controversy. All I desire is the *truth.* Make what you say in your Statement clear and consistent, and I will go at that Mr. Gould, to speak after the manner of old fashioned people, "hammer and tongs." I'm an old fashioned man, you know. don't forget that. As I now view your Statement, it is very odd, Mr. Olcott, very odd.

Olcott—It can all be explained, sir, all of it. Every particular shall be made satisfactory. Come in to-morrow and we will

resume the conversation. Your influence, I *feel* to be very important in this emergency, but you will please not mention these January—

Donor—Oh, as to the January Resolutions, never mind what I say about them. It is only the chattering of an old fashioned man. But those resolutions do seem very odd, Mr. Olcott, very odd.

Olcott—Well, my Bank business is pressing. System, sir, system, is my motto. Come in to-morrow. Good morning.

Putting on his old fashioned hat and taking a pinch of snuff, our old fashioned gentleman walked thoughtfully out of the Bank, muttering as he went, "Very odd, Mr. Olcott, very odd."

Reported by

ALBANY.

X.

SUPPOSED DIALOGUE CONTINUED.

Gentlemen—Profoundly impressed with the idea of Mr. Olcott's systematic habits, our friend the Donor, was punctual to the hour. His bearing was that of an old-fashioned matter-of-fact gentleman. You may well conclude that the preliminaries were speedily despatched and the former conversation resumed.

Donor to Mr. Olcott—Mr. Olcott, I see by your Statement that you gave $10,000 to the Observatory. I am informed that in fact you gave ten New York Central six per cent bonds. Do you call that giving $10,000? Do you not know that the average price of those bonds has not exceeded eighty-five per cent for several years? At the highest estimate then your donation *ought* not to be placed above $8,500.

Olcott—Will they not be worth $10,000 when they are paid?

Donor—There can be no doubt that when they become worth $10,000 they will be worth $10,000. Most of us paid the *cash*—you did not. Had you paid the *cash*, you would be entitled to be called a $10,000 donor. Will your Board return our money and allow us to replace it with the same kind of securities that you gave, and accept them at par? If you will the other donors will receive back about $20,000. Or if you prefer, suppose you

pay in the difference of $1,500 with the interest, and then the Observatory will have some $2,000 more towards liquidating its indebtedness. Otherwise we cannot see how you can *publish* yourself to the world as a $10,000 donor. Very odd, Mr. Olcott, very odd.

Olcott—Are not ten bonds for $1000 each equivalent to $10,000 ?

Donor—Yes, if that is their average market value. There are parties in our city who will give twenty, forty, or fifty thousand dollars to the Observatory, provided you will receive in payment the old Canal Bank stock at par. But the market value of that stock is quite another matter.

Olcott—What do you mean, sir ?

Donor—Pray do not be offended. I merely alluded to that to illustrate the difference between the value of a piece of paper in respect to what it purports to be worth on its face, and its real market value. Will you discount a $10,000 note at your bank with ten six per cent N. Y. Central bonds as collateral security, the note being otherwise worthless ? If not, ought a contribution of ten of these bonds to the Observatory to be estimated at $10,000 ? Very odd, Mr. Olcott, very odd.

Olcott—I am not here, sir, to be catechised about my own business. You will please drop that subject.

Donor—Willingly, for I wish to call your attention to other matters. In your speech of the 26th of June, you estimate the value of the Observatory property, *exclusive* of the lands given by Gen. Van Rensselaer, as follows :

Observatory building, worth.....	$50,000
Dwelling house, worth,.....	10,000
Endowment of Mrs. Dudley,.....	50,000
In the 2nd edition of your Inauguration pamphlet, you say, "The *Trustees* have appropriated since the Inauguration for the purchase of books, instruments and equipments, about".....	30,000
As you say the Trustees did this, this last item was of course a legitimate and proper expenditure. You have then a total of justifiable expenditure and of good property amounting to the nice sum of.....	$140,000
Add the amount which you say Dr. Gould wasted, i. e.,.....	40,000
Grand total,.....	$180,000

From various sources we get a clue to your receipts as follows :

Donations as published in your 2nd edition of your Inauguration pamphlet,	$124,500
Previous donations not *named* in that list, about	9,000
Subsequent donations that we have heard of, but which you omitted to name,	1,000
Total receipts about	$134,500

Deduct from $180,000 the probable receipts, $134,500, and there is a balance *unaccounted* for of $45,500 ! ! Will you please inform me where this money came from, and on what Dr. Gould wasted the $40,000 ?

Olcott—But the $30,000 appropriated by us for books, instruments, and equipments were a part of the money which Gould wasted.

Donor—You forget. For you tell us on pages 81 and 82 of your "Statement" that the $40,000 were "*exclusive* of the sums that have been paid for Observatory instruments." Let us omit the round sum of $30,000 and figure again, with reference to the value of the property.

In your speech of the 26th of June, you say the Observatory building and dwelling house are worth		$60,000
You say you have Mrs. Dudley's endowment,		50,000
You say the calculating engine is worth		5,000
You say you have several instruments worth		2,000
We know you have the meridian circle, worth		5,000
We know you have the library, worth, at least,		2,000
Add the allowance to Spencer for the heliometer, of		7,000
These items give us a total of		$131,000
Total cash receipts, so far as we can judge, are	$134,500	
Deduct above estimate of legitimate authorized investments,	131,000	
Balance,		$3,500

There were no doubt many incidental items, such as insurance, stationary, printing, payments to Dr. Armsby for his expenses when on Observatory business, to men for watching and taking care of buildings, &c., more than enough to absorb the $3,500. Now this still leaves us in the dark as to where the $40,000 came

from that Gould wasted ; and as to *how* or on *what* it was wasted. Either you have received about $40,000 more in cash than above shown, or else you have made some very strange assertions. That you have stated a deliberate untruth I do not say, but I do say that if you did not receive the $40,000 in addition to the above estimated cash receipts, some of your statements smack strongly of a slight prolongation of elongated veracity. This is very odd, Mr. Olcott—very odd.

Olcott—Perhaps the sum of $40,000 was not strictly accurate. At all events, Gould has been very wasteful and extravagant.

Donor—So then you are willing to positively assert and repeat the assertion 15,000 times over, or which is the same thing, by printing 15,000 copies of your Statement, that Dr. Gould wasted $40,000 of the Observatory money, and yet cannot tell where the money came from nor how or where it was wasted?

Olcott—I did not say that. What I said was that the amount of $40,000 might not be strictly accurate.

Donor—Do systematic men like you make a grave charge, pledge your own weight of character for its truthfulness and yet have no other basis for it than mere conjecture? If your statement was not accurate why did you make it? Very odd, Mr. Olcott, very odd.

Olcott—We can establish substantially all we have stated, and will do so at the proper time.

Donor But you have yourself accounted for and approved of expenditures and investments as legitimate and proper to an amount equal to the total contributions paid to the Observatory. How then could Dr. Gould waste $40,000? Has that amount been contributed besides the amounts made public? If so, you have in reality received at least $171,000. This reminds me of other questions I wish to ask. Where is Mr. Everett's donation of $500? Why was his name omitted from your list of donors? What has become of Cornelius Wendell's $500? Mrs. Dudley gave in all $77,500. Why did you place the amount in your list at $76,500? Very odd, Mr. Olcott, very odd.

Olcott—Errors may easily occur in the sums named in these various documents. Absolute accuracy ought not to be expected till a systematic exhibit shall be made.

Donor—Pray tell me when we shall have that exhibit. You are so systematic in the management of your Bank that you cause a statement to be placed before your directors every week. But Trustees of the Observatory who have acted as such for six years, have not been able to this day to see an exhibit of its affairs. Very odd, Mr. Olcott, very odd.

Olcott—There is a vast difference, sir, between an Observatory and a Bank.

Donor—Justice to yourself requires me to say that you have in respect to this matter, made a most remarkable difference. Justice to the donors and the public requires me to say that the great cardinal principles of business are the same whether applied to a bank or an Observatory. We as donors have rights, sir, which you are bound to respect. We have rights, too, which shall be respected. You have asserted positively that $40,000 of our money have been "worse than wasted." This is a momentous announcement for you to make, one which demands a most searching investigation on the part of the donors. If it be true, either you are responsible for this waste or Dr. Gould is. Yon say the latter; we want the proof. Give us the items and the vouchers.

Olcott—Did we not prove all this in our Statement? Did we not produce any number of extracts from Dr. Gould's own letters to prove the charge? And do we not convey the impression on page 81 that the loss of the $40,000 is shown by the Treasurer's books? Are we not all honorable men? Why then call for more proof?

Donor—Mr. Olcott, need I repeat to you that this is a grave matter? Excuse me, sir, old fashioned men do not do business in this way. Permit me to say that other parties, not the accuser, are to be the judges as to the nature of the proof required. Falsified quotations of letters introduced by adroit inuendos, and followed by perverse inferences, will never pass for conclusive testimony.

Olcott—Do you assert, sir, that I have garbled Dr. Gould's letter's?

Donor—No, sir. I hope it will turn out otherwise. Who did it I cannot say. But I will say it has been done by somebody.

I will say, further, that the fact of many of those letters having been addressed to you, is a very unfortunate circumstance. Yes, sir, it is very odd, Mr. Olcott, very odd. Besides, sir, this garbling appears extensively in printed documents. "Albany" informs me that Dr. Gould's speech is altered in important respects in your second edition of your Inauguration pamphlet, as compared with the first edition; and that these alterations, by a very singular coincidence, make Dr. Gould say (contrary to what he really did say) the same things that are set forth in your "Statement." "Albany" says further, that these alterations in your second edition of your Inauguration pamplet were made by *one* of your Trustees, and that he withholds his name solely out of compassion for the man himself. He will not mention his name now, for fear that mischevious people may think that the same hand has been concerned in the other garblings. Perhaps if some of your number will press "Albany" to the point he will disclose the name. That some one has atrociously garbled Dr. Gould's letters, and that this Inauguration speech has likewise been garbled, are facts that cannot be doubted. Now, Dr. Gould says—

Olcott—Don't believe one word that Dr. Gould says. Didn't you read in our Statement what a monstrous lie he told on the day of the Inauguration, about the Corning clock?

Donor—That was another very odd thing, Mr. Olcott. I am told there *was* a clock at that very moment in the Observatory with Erastus Corning's name inscribed upon it as the giver. Dr. Armsby caused the inscription to be placed on the tablet. How then did Gould lie about it? Or, if he did, how could you associate with him on intimate terms, and continually indorse him for nearly two years afterwards? Your Statement exhibits abundant proof that you did this. Indeed, in one of your letters to him, written near the close of 1857, you tell him that you are willing to sink or swim with him as the "only chance" of immortalizing yourself in this world. What! willing to "sink or swim" with a liar? Very odd, Mr. Olcott, very odd. Now, to return to the garbled letters. We regard—

Olcott—Do you intend to constantly hurl these letters in my face as you did the January resolutions? Will you pile insult upon insult?

Donor—Your memory betrays you. You were the first to refer to these letters. When, in my old fashioned matter-of-fact way I asked you for the items and vouchers to prove this grave charge, you pointed to these letters as you do in your Statement, as sufficient evidence. I asserted that the credibility of these quotations is destroyed by the form in which they are given. Your witnesses, therefore, stand impeached.

Olcott—Well, sir, after all, this great ado about garbling is only a side issue. The great question is, shall Dr. Gould hold possession of the Observatory?

Donor—In the estimation of the Donors, you will permit me to say, there *is* an issue between you and us of far more importance than mere possession of the Observatory. We wish to ascertain what has become of the $40,000—*who* paid it out—*who* took and *who* made the vouchers—in short, *who* is, in point of fact, responsible. You affirm that Dr. Gould is, and adduce pretended quotations from his letters to prove it. Why attempt to evade the issue? Meet it, sir, like a man. Bring forth and lay your vouchers before me on this table. You are a systematic man, sir.

Olcott—I have letters from Boston and from all parts of the country from gentlemen of high standing, who say that our Statement, which, by the by, is a *masterly* document, makes our case clear and conclusive. With assurances of such a nature before us, do you suppose we will offer further proof? When we have made our case so clear that these high-toned gentlemen pronounce it overwhelmingly sufficient, it is useless for you to ask, or for us to offer, more. Wouldn't you like to see the letters I have received?

Donor—Really, Mr. Olcott, another class of vouchers would be more convincing to me than letters from abroad, written by gentlemen who extemporaneously decide an issue before the testimony is closed. It was natural that these gentlemen should believe your witnesses, but they would have displayed marks of cooler wisdom had they waited for the rebutting testimony. That they should write such letters was very odd, Mr. Olcott, very odd.

Olcott—Why, sir, these letters satisfy my co-Trustees—perfectly satisfy them, sir.

Donor—Doubtless such letters are more satisfactory to them than garbled letters are to us.

Olcott—Still you harp on that garbling. What of it? The meaning is not changed.

Donor—Why, then, were they garbled? Why were parts of sentences struck out, words substituted, words fabricated, and sentences transposed? Very odd, Mr. Olcott, very odd.

Olcott—At all events, we can prove our charges without Gould's letters.

Donor—Thank you, sir. Of course, you allude to those vouchers I asked you for. They will solve the riddle. Show the drafts drawn upon you by Dr. Gould—show the bills for the expenditures indorsed or certified by him—show his own receipts—and if those vouchers prove him to have wasted the $40,000, I will denounce him from Dan to Beersheeba.

Olcott—We hold that it is enough if we show that it was done under his "auspices," and that we prove by quotations from his letters.

Donor—What! a systematic business man like you attempt to hold another responsible for drafts he never signed, bills that he never certified and never saw, and receipts he never even heard of. Very odd, Mr. Olcott, very odd.

Olcott—Don't we specify in our Statement, drafts drawn on us by him; and don't we state that we paid them?

Donor—Certainly, but they are only for a trifling amount. Besides, they were for books and instruments, and you tell us that the $40,000 were "exclusive of Observatory instruments." The truth, Mr. Olcott, is very apparent to my mind. If these vouchers had been in your possession, you never would have made such a "Statement" as you have made. No man who knows you will believe for an instant that, if you had possessed the vouchers to sustain this momentous charge, you would have withheld them when you put forth your "Statement." You, of all men, are the last to make use of indirect and doubtful evidences when you have at hand those which are positive and explicit.

Olcott—Do not the affidavits of the engineer and architects prove that Dr. Gould supervised the expenditures? What more proof do you want?

Donor—But these affidavits do not say that Dr. Gould ordered things to be done without the sanction of the Trustees—nor have you adduced any proof to show that he did more than to give suggestions and directions in answer to applications from members of your own Board. He pointed out what ought to be done and these members of your Board undertook to manage the expenditures.

If he took the essential responsibility, why did he not, as is always the case in like operations, audit the bills and sign or countersign the vouchers? Dr. Gould can safely challenge you to produce vouchers that bear his endorsement to an amount that exceeds $4,000. Where then are the $40,000? Where *was* Dr. Gould all this time? He was seldom here. He lived 200 miles away. Another significant fact is, that your favorite, your "practical, profound," Dr. Peters, a man who did not abound in "contrivances of a useless and visionary character," was, most of this time, the active manager of affairs at the Observatory. Why do those affidavits throw him into the background. Again. You boast that Dr. Gould was not Director, because you had never offered him the Directorship till January. At your 19th of January meeting, though he told you—as you affirm in your speech of the 26th of June—that he was not responsible for the past expenditure at the Observatory, you passed resolutions endorsing him and made him Director. According to your "Statement," the expenditures were made before this—the money was wasted when Dr. Gould did not have personal charge of the Observatory. On pages 17 and 18 of your 26th of June speech, I read—

"The Committee discovered, in 1857, an unaccountable abatement of zeal on the part of Dr. Gould—not only a reluctance to come on and take charge of the Observatory, but a strange disposition to put off mounting the instruments, and to delay progress in general."

Now, if you are to be believed, during the *very period* while he was *actively* engaged in wasting $40,000 of your money, he *did*

not have charge of the Observatory—he showed "an unaccountable abatement of zeal"—he discovered "not only a reluctance to take charge, but a strange disposition to put off mounting the instruments, and to delay progress in general!" How Dr. Gould could have employed the year 1857 in *doing nothing*—indeed, in positively *hindering* "progress in general," and at the same time be actively engaged in wasting $40,000 of your money at the Observatory, while he was absent from it—seems to a plain matter-of-fact man, very odd, Mr. Olcott, very odd.

Olcott—Notwithstanding all that, Dr. Gould is, in point of fact, responsible, because he was our adviser.

Donor—Being a matter-of-fact man, I conclude the facts then to be these. In fact he did not, in point of fact, have charge of the Observatory, yet he was in fact responsible. In point of fact, he lived in Cambridge; in fact, he did nothing for you in 1857; on the contrary, he hindered "progress in general;" yet, in point of fact, his active operations at the Observatory during the time he was thus inactive, resulted in wasting $40,000 of your money! Very odd, Mr. Olcott, very odd.

Olcott—Do you pretend, sir, that we have not produced sufficient evidence that Gould, and Gould alone, was the responsible party?

Donor. Most assuredly I do, if you are to be believed. For, in your speech of the 26th of June, you say, on page 17: "Up to near the close of 1857, I believe, Dr. Gould enjoyed the confidence of the Trustees—had their ready concurrence in all his schemes, and the use of unrestricted means, for their execution." You concurred, therefore, heartily concurred and sanctioned, "all the schemes" by which the $40,000, were wasted. You had the money and poured it out with "unrestricted" measure. Why, then, should not the donors and the pnblic hold you responsible? By what logic or arithmetic can we arrive at any other conclusion?

Olcott—"That they have greatly erred, the Trustees painfully realize. But for this they claim that they are entitled to be judged with some indulgence."

Donor—So you remark on page 169 of your Statement. On what ground do you claim indulgent judgment? Is it for the

benefits you have conferred on the cause of science by bringing the Observatory into inextricable difficulties? Who, after this, will give or bequeath his odd thousands to like institutions? You have destroyed confidence here and all over the country in the management of such institutions, by independent boards of trustees. You could have prevented this deplorable consequence by a simple waving of your hand. Shall we judge you with "indulgence," in requital for the numerous indulgent judgments you have uttered respecting Dr. Gould, and others whom you have assailed in your "Statement?" "Judge not that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be *measured to you again.*" Good day, Mr. Olcott, good day, sir.

Our old-fashioned gentleman with his cane under his arm and snuff box in his hand, had nearly reached the door when he suddenly wheeled and propounded another question. By the by, said he, will you please to tell me, Mr. Olcott, what you think of the articles signed "Albany?"

Olcott—What do I think of them? Ribald abuse, sir, ribald abuse. Why should the man who writes them interfere in this controversy? He is not a donor.

Donor—*Three* of your majority Trustees, I am informed, are not donors. Certainly their names are not in your published list. Allow me to ask you in return why should *they* interfere? If to be a donor is an essential qualification to authorize one to participate in the controversy, why did you, with about a hundred donors on your list, pass them all by and choose three men as Trustees who had never given a dollar? I can understand why—particularly with respect to two of them. They were men who could be made subservient agencies to accomplish certain objects. When you put such men in your board, it does not lie in your mouth to complain of "Albany" because he is not a donor. Please to specify, sir, what "Albany" has written that renders him obnoxious to your censure?

Olcott—Written? What has he not written? He is a villifier of character, sir.

Donor—Once upon a time a singular case came under my observation. There lived in a distant city a gentleman whose

life had been consecrated to astronomy. Many long years had he devoted to his favorite science. His ambition was to build for himself a reputation—to carve his name among the many other illustrious names already chiseled on the tablet of astronomical fame. Before the age of thirty-five, success had crowned his efforts. All the great astronomers of Europe and America were proud to acknowledge his right to an equal rank with themselves. Having obtained this high scientific and moral position, a board of Trustees induced him to move to Albany and take charge of a new Observatory. Brilliant prospects were held before him. The President of the board even wrote to him that he and his co-trustees "were willing to sink or swim" with him for the purpose of immortalizing their own names. Buoyant with hope he came. A short time elapsed, and a melancholy change ensued. The very hand which wrote the words just repeated, inspired by a bitterness more bitter than gall, attaches its signature to charges which were unprovoked and which were designed to blast forever that hitherto spotless and illustrious reputation.

It was boldly proclaimed to the world that this man was a liar, and that his assailants had known the fact for nearly two years. It was proclaimed that he had attempted to "individually pocket" money not his own. It was proclaimed that he had recklessly wasted $40 000 of the Trustees' funds. It was insinuated that instead of being "an accomplished astronomer," he was in fact a "visionary, pedantic theorist"—and it was boldly charged that he was incompetent. Could detraction go further? Yes, and it did go further. The sanctity of social confidence was ruthlessly invaded. Letters in their own nature private—letters even marked "private" and "confidential"—letters written in that unsuspecting freedom with which friend holds converse with friend, were garbled, distorted, mutilated and mangled, and these distortions and mutilations, being thus prepared, were published, and sent to all parts of the civilized world, as evidence to sustain these charges. Almost daily for months, the mails were loaded with pamphlets containing these inhuman falsifications. They were sent to almost every city, village and hamlet in America. Ocean steamers bore them to

Europe. Had the Evil Genius, who presides over the powers of darkness, called to his aid his myriads of grim-visaged subalterns and commissioned them to fly through the skies and scatter these pamphlets over the earth, it could not have been more effectually done. Whether we contemplate the exalted position of the victim, or the nature of the charges, or the diabolical appliances brought to bear upon him for the purpose of effecting his ruin or the power of his assailants, there is not an element nor a circumstance wanting to make out the most extraordinary and aggravated case of gratuitous persecution. Who was the master villifier in this case? Was he the man who calls "Albany" a villifier of character? The very utterance of the accusation ought to burn his lips and paralize his tongue. Shall I also enumerate the assaults contained in that pamphlet on Hon. Erastus Corning, J. V. L. Pruyn, Gen. Van Rensselaer, Mrs. Dudley and the committee of citizens, composed of twelve gentlemen, who, in point of intellectual, moral and social worth, are far above their assailants? Shall I specify the wicked assaults made upon Professors Henry, Peirce and Bache? It comes with an ill grace from the assailants of these parties to stigmatize "Albany" as a villifier of character.

Olcott—Sir, you shall not address such language to me. I will suffer no man to do it with impunity.

Donor—

> "The earth was not of my mind,
> If you suppose, as fearing *you*, it shook."

Turning on his heel without even a parting salutation, our friend immediately started on his intended visit to Mrs. Dudley. Every few steps—and they were rather excited steps—he would pause to calm his nerves with a pinch of snuff, alternating each with rapid exclamations of—very odd, Mr. Olcott, very odd—(shaking his head,) very, very odd. Reported by

ALBANY.

XI.

ACT OF INCORPORATION.

GENTLEMEN :

The Act of Incorporation whereby you caused yourselves to be constituted Trustees of the Dudley Observatory, deserves and will no doubt receive the proper attention on the part of the Donors to the Institution. We see in that Act the impress of the same ambitious hand that has controlled your action thus far, and which will never loosen its grasp upon the property of the Donors so long as the law which itself created and from which it has derived its power shall remain unaltered. That Act, like many of the other proceedings which have been brought to light by this controversy, as I will now show, was a gross imposition both upon the Donors and the public. While Mr. Olcott and Dr. Armsby held out, as an inducement to procure subscriptions to the Institution, the avowal that it was designed to be the nucleus and form a part of a National University, the moment they had obtained a sufficient sum to suit their purpose, they secured the passage of the Act in question. Did it in any respect conform to that inducement ? Let the Donors read the Act and judge. It contained no provision for a choice of their Trustees by the Donors themselves. They were not permitted to have the slightest voice either in the primary organization of the Board or control over the management of the affairs of the Observatory by a subsequent election of their own Trustees. On the contrary, they were compelled to receive and be content, without the power of changing them, with such Trustees as were named in the Act itself. A few of these gentlemen, it is true, were unexceptionable, but care was taken to secure a majority who gave promise of little else than subserviency to the behests of a single will. Of this majority, now consisting of the famous Nine—three, viz : Samuel H. Ransom, Robert H. Pruyn and Isaac W. Vosburgh, appear in their published list of Donors as having together contributed nine hundred and fifty dollars—and three others, viz : James H. Armsby, Alden March and Ira Harris (the latter having been lately chosen) do not appear as contributors at all ! All these six gentlemen, except one, were

originally constituted Trustees. The one, Ira Harris, who does not appear as a Donor, was chosen by his present co-Trustees to fill the vacancy occasioned by the resignation of Gen. Van Rensselaer, while actual Donors in our city, gentlemen every way competent in point of standing and education, were thrust aside; a result which could not have happened had the contributors been allowed to make their own selection. Such is the practical working of the Act of Incorporation with respect to the organization of the Board. The great body of the contributors are excluded from having any voice whatever in the management of the Institution that has been erected through their munificence. Another remarkable peculiarity of the Act was the entire absence of any provision whereby the Board would be rendered subject to the supervisory or appellate jurisdiction of that class of our State officials who have more especial charge of matters pertaining to education and science. When it is recollected that the Observatory was originated and urged upon the attention of our citizens on the ground that it was intended to be, and would, in all probability, become the nucleus of a National University, the incongruity of this omission will not fail to impress all who are truly friendly to the cause of science. In a historical notice of the Observatory, to be found in Munsell's Annals of Albany, and which is said to have been furnished by Dr. Armsby, the avowed professions of the original projectors of the Institution are set forth, as follows:

"During the summer of 1852, several influential gentlemen of the city became impressed with the conviction that something more should be accomplished by the State of New York in the cause of popular education. Though aware that our system of common schools, our academies and colleges, were answering all the purposes which their respective founders had in view, still there seemed to be a deficiency of adequate facilities for prosecuting the higher branches of education to their fullest extent; in consequence of which our young men were driven to foreign countries for advantages which should be furnished them at home. This suggested the idea of a National University, an institution possessing a character that would meet the exigency in question. Several public meetings were held in relation to

this matter, which many distinguished gentlemen and scholars from other States attended, and favored with their sympathies and counsels. As a result of these deliberations, and as a *part of the great project* which we hope yet to see fully realized, it was resolved to establish, at the Capital of the Empire State, an Astronomical Observatory, with such instruments and agents as would meet the present demands of astronomical science. In prosecuting this object, it is *gratifying to record the liberal and cheerful response* that was made to individual application for the necessary funds."

Notwithstanding the promised expansiveness of this contemplated Institution—notwithstanding it was intended ultimately to embrace all the advantages which a National University could supply and thereby to afford every possible facility for a complete education especially to the young men of the Empire State—notwithstanding all this, the supreme control of its affairs was limited to a practically irresponsible Board of Trustees. Neither the Regents of the University nor any of our higher State Officers were allowed to participate in its management. Most of the important Scientific Institutions of our State are, to a greater or less extent, under the control of the Regents of the University or our State Officers. The Observatory at Ann Arbor, though established by *private* subscription, is subject to the supervision of the Regents of the University of Michigan. They appoint its officers and control its direction. An article lately published in the Atlas and Argus, a very timely and much needed article, shows how well this system works in Michigan and furnishes a safe precedent for our Legislature to follow should they amend the act incorporating our Observatory. These Nine Trustees should be no longer permitted to usurp, under the color of law, an authority so manifestly inconsistent with the *avowed* objects of the Institution, as set forth at the outset by themselves and on the *strength* of which, as appears by their own showing, the *original subscriptions* were obtained.

Still another defect in the Act of Incorporation, and, no doubt on the part of its framers, an intentional defect, is the omission to require of the Trustees an annual report either to the Donors or the Legislature, of the financial condition of the Institution

As the act exists, they are left at liberty to conceal both from the Donors and the public all information of their financial proceedings, and they have of late availed themselves of that liberty to its fullest extent. They make charges against other parties which could be readily disproved were it possible to extort from them a full disclosure of their financial operations, but they wisely withhold all these evidences. The plain English of their entire conduct towards the Donors is—"we have your money—the law has placed it in our hands—we will manage it to suit ourselves and will suffer no interference and will answer no questions." It is now about six years since the organization of this Board. To this day they have made no financial report, though often called upon to do so. Large sums of money have been received, invested and disbursed, but the donors are not allowed to know by whom received, by whom or how investments have been made, or by whom or how the greater portion has been expended. Will the Legislature permit this state of things to continue?

Thus it will be seen that they have had the Act of Incorporation so framed as to conform to, and further, their own selfish ends. They have secured their own appointment and continuation as Trustees under it, without regard to the choice of the Donors. They have made themselves independent of the supervisory control or jurisdiction of our State Officers and are not bound by law to report to the Donors or Legislature an annual account of their proceedings either financially or otherwise. They are, to all intents and purposes, an independent and irresponsible body. To confer unrestricted power like this on any set of men in our day is a legal incongruity. It is contrary to the spirit of our laws, to the acknowledged policy of the State and pre-eminently inconsistent with the original plan and intent of the Institution. The chief aim of the Donors should now be to procure the interposition of the Legislature, have the law properly amended and the Observatory placed under the jurisdiction and control of the Regents of the University, or some other disposition made of it which will secure its permanent usefulness. This is of more consequence to them than any temporary questions now subsisting between the Nine Trustees and the Scien-

tific Council. When the Observatory shall cease to be used for the purpose of the personal aggrandizement of a few of its present Trustees, then and not till then may we hope for the adoption of a policy that will accord with the true interests of science. But it is vain to hope for this under the existing law and with the present organization of the Board of Trustees.

ALBANY.

XII.

LETTER BY THE AUTHOR TO HON. ERASTUS CORNING, AND MR. CORNING'S REPLY.

ALBANY, Dec. 2d, 1858.

HON. ERASTUS CORNING:

Dear Sir—In a series of articles recently published in the Atlas & Argus, over the signature of "Albany," the authorship of which I have avowed, I have had occasion to make several allusions to the attack upon you by the Nine Trustees of the Dudley Observatory in their late "Statement." Having, by personal inquiry, ascertained from you the true state of the case, I felt justified in characterizing that attack as entirely gratuitous, not being warranted by even the semblance of truth. As these articles are about to be issued in pamphlet form, I desire to fortify the position I have taken on this point by obtaining from you, for the purpose of publication, a statement of the facts pertaining to your original subscription to the Observatory and your version of that transaction. I am well aware of your unwillingness to notice personal attacks of this nature, and would not solicit the favor were it possible to attain my object in any other way. Permit me to say, however, that I am not alone in the expression of the opinion, that the extraordinary proceedings of the Nine Trustees in assailing as they have, without the shadow of an excuse, the private characters of subscribers to the Institution—preferring against them charges of grave importance—affirming these charges to be true by attaching their proper names to the document containing them—and then multiplying the circulation of that document by the tens of

thousands, constitute an outrage which demands a thorough exposure of the malevolence in which it originated, and the effrontery with which it is attempted to be sustained. Some of these gentlemen, immediately after the publication of their Statement, expressed regret that the allegations against you had been preferred. But they have made no public apology or retraction. When men will so far forget the obligations of honor as to allow their names to remain before the public to support charges which they know to be false, and that, too, with respect to their own neighbors, it is proper that they should be exposed, and that their fellow-citizens should know what may be expected from them hereafter. Your name has been inscribed at the Observatory, for more than two years, as the giver of a clock. It was done by direction of the Trustees themselves This is of itself a sufficient proof that they had no real apprehension of a failure on your part to fulfill your agreement in relation to the clock yet to be completed. The motives for the attack upon you could not have had the remotest connection with your original subscription or any subsequent transaction between you and these gentlemen, and must be otherwise accounted for. I may also remark that, although their reference to you is totally foreign to the ostensible and avowed object of their "Statement," they have, nevertheless, seen fit to make it a part of the Observatory controversy. It is, therefore, just and proper that all the facts should be known.

Yours,

GEO. H. THACHER.

ALBANY, DECEMBER 3, 1858.

DEAR SIR :

The time which has elapsed since the appearance of the "Statement," by nine of the Trustees of the Dudley Observatory, affords ample evidence of the intention I had, and to which you refer in your letter of yesterday, not to appear before the public in reference to the personal allusions to me in that publication. Your request however is made under such circumstances, that I cannot well refuse to state the facts, which I shall do very briefly as nearly as I can now recall them.

In the outset of the Observatory enterprise, I was requested, I think by Dr. Armsby, to contribute to the fund. It was intended to raise $25,000—about $5,000 of which I understood was expected to be obtained in comparatively small amounts, and the balance of $20,000 in larger sums. I subscribed one thousand dollars on condition that nineteen others should each contribute a like amount. My subscription was conditional for reasons which I have stated to you verbally, and which I need not now repeat, unless it be to say that a principal one was, that I believed this course, if successful, would enlist a strong influence in favor of the Institution, and give it a large number of warm and active friends. Time has fully confirmed the correctness of the views I then entertained ; for I think I hazard nothing in saying, that no trust like that of the Observatory could have been so sadly mismanaged had the majority of the Trustees been gentlemen who from their early contributions had felt an interest in its success, in place of being persons, most of whom had contributed but little to its endowment, and others not at all. Mrs. Dudley shortly afterwards very liberally gave the largest part of the amount sought to be raised, and the plan to which I had subscribed was abandoned. The Nine Trustees admit that the condition attached to my subscription was not complied with, and yet charge me with repudiation in not paying the amount ; how truthfully will be the better understood when I add that, at the request of Dr. Armsby and in order that nothing to which I stood in the remotest degree committed, should be left unfulfilled, I agreed to transfer the conditional subscription which I had thus made, to the purchase of a Siderial clock to be paid for when it should be finished and placed in the Observatory. The clock, I learn, was ordered at Altona by Dr. Gould with the sanction of the Trustees, but has not yet been received. Although the conduct of the majority of the Trustees has been such as to absolve me from all honorable obligation on this subscription, I intend, nevertheless, when the clock shall have been completed and placed in the Observatory, to pay the amount. That I am not mistaken in what I say as to the terms of my subscription, I can appeal to the Trustees themselves, to show the facts and the consequent falsity of their charge against me ; for in a second

edition of the "Inauguration" pamphlet published by them the present year, in enumerating certain donations to the Observatory they say:

"The Corning Clock was ordered by Dr. Gould, in Altona, in 1855. It will cost $1,000; Hon. Erastus Corning has agreed to pay for it *when it is completed.*"

I know nothing about the inscription to which you refer as being on the clock now at the Observatory, indicating that it was presented by me, but have been informed that it was placed there under the direction of Dr. Armsby before the Inauguration for the reasons mentioned in one of your published articles. I was not informed or in any way consulted in regard to it.

These are the facts; and I leave it to a fair-minded and honest public, I leave it especially to the citizens of Albany to whom I have been known for nearly forty-five years, to whom I am indebted for many marks of confidence, and with whose business and interests, I trust it will not be considered egotistical in me to say, I have been for many years largely and closely identified, to judge as to the truth or falsehood of the charge of repudiation thus made against me. I have been informed of the circumstance to which you refer, that some of the Trustees, whose names were, by their consent, appended to the "Statement," had remarked, immediately after its publication, that they regretted and disapproved of its personal allusions to me and to others. Still these gentlemen who have thus given the sanction of their names to these unfounded charges, and through an unprecedented edition of their publication have sent them to every part of the country, to every College, Seminary of learning, and Library, to every public officer, and every prominent citizen whose address they could well procure, lack the moral honesty and courage to withdraw them as publicly as they were made; a duty which they owed alike to community, to the parties assailed, and to themselves. Indeed the worst feature of the Observatory controversy is the moral recklessness, if I may so term it, which has marked the course of the majority of the Trustees. Several of them no doubt were willing in the outset implicitly to follow the counsels of a few of their number by whom they were deceived and misled, but when the facts were ascertained, when it was manifest that

gross mis-statements had been made and that individuals had been unjustly assailed, these gentlemen were bound by every obligation of truth and justice to disavow any further responsibility for the charges they had thus made. It might have been expected that if such considerations could not influence them, they would have had some regard to the views of the very considerable minority of their Board who declined to unite in the action of the majority, a fact which ought in itself to have induced caution and reflection, but it seems to have had no effect. They have chosen to remain silent, prefering to become partners in the moral turpitude of their associates, rather than make an open and manly avowal of their error; an avowal which might have been made without the least sacrifice of personal honor, and without any prejudice to the other questions involved in the controversy.

But notwithstanding the exposure by your articles, and in various other ways, of the untruths contained in the "Statement;" notwithstanding the outrageous manner in which it garbled Dr. Gould's letters, so much so as to compel the Trustees publicly to take notice of the charge and attempt to answer it; notwithstanding the many facts and circumstances publicly disclosed and discussed since it appeared, and which have shown so many of its assertions to be unworthy of confidence, it has been continually sent out in great numbers to every part of the country, and recently, as I am credibly informed, a further edition has been issued, to be distributed, no doubt, as were the others, as far and as wide as the post can carry it. Yet will it be credited—shame that such should be the fact—this document, thus abounding with mistatements and untruths, is deliberately and designedly sent out under such circumstances with the signatures and the sanction of gentlemen, claiming character and position in society, several of whom are the teachers of morals in Sunday Schools, and nearly all of whom are members, yes, prominent and leading members of Christian Churches in our city.

Yours, with regard,

ERASTUS CORNING.

G. H. Thacher, Esq.,

Albany.

XIII.

LETTER BY J. V. L. PRUYN, ESQ.

The following Letter, from J. V. L. Pruyn, bears out the statements contained in my introductory article, in relation to the fraudulent procurement of the petition asking for the appointment of Dr. Peters as Observer. It also exposes, like the letter of Mr. Corning, the animus of the "Statement" of the Nine Trustees, and exhibits their utter diregard of a certain element of character which all honorable men most highly prize. I leave the reader to make his own application of this remark after he shall have perused Mr. Pruyn's letter.

G. H. T.

Editors Atlas & Argus:

GENTLEMEN:

Absence from the city for some time past, has prevented an earlier notice of the personal allusions to me, contained in the "Statement" recently published by Nine of the Trustees of the Dudley Observatory, in regard to the affairs of that Institution. The flagrant violation in the "Statement," of the rule which, among honorable men, protects private correspondence, its attacks upon personal character, and its other departures from the line of fair and legitimate defence, stamp its character unmistakably.

The Committee appointed at the meeting of Citizens, felt that in stating, as they did in their Address, their reasons for censuring the course of those whom they had long known as fellow citizens, and in many cases as friends, good taste and good feeling alike called upon them to avoid personal reflections, and to speak only of official acts. The Trustees have chosen to pursue a different course, and they must be responsible for the results.

At page 53, of the "Statement," it is alleged that under what are there called the "embarrassing circumstances," in which the Trustees were placed, "some of the largest donors out of the "Board of Trustees, with other citizens of Albany, began to in-"terest themselves, urging the necessity of independent action, "and on the first day of January (1858) the Trustees received

"a document, of which the following is a copy:" The document then set forth, having a considerable number of signatures attached, urges "upon the consideration of the Trustees the pro-"priety of appointing" Dr. Peters an observer in the Institution; and it is stated that on the *ninth* day of January, 1858, the Trustees "acting upon the request," passed certain resolutions, which are quoted at length. One of these was highly complimentary to the "Scientific Council," and "the distinguished Superintendent "of the Coast Survey," declaring that "the Trustees would ever "receive with the greatest deference and respect the suggestions "of gentlemen whose names are so illustrious in Science, and "who are so distinguished in their efforts for its advancement;" another appointed Dr. Peters as an Observer in the Institution.

It may fairly be inferred that the dates of the first and ninth of January above mentioned, were stated to show that the Trustees acted with deliberation in considering the document thus presented to them, and in the appointment of Dr. Peters. My signature to this paper is now referred to, as evidence of a want of "consistency" on my part in regard to the management of the Observatory. It will be observed that this document was most artfully drawn. It complains of delay in putting the Observatory into operation, but does not venture to charge the delay upon the Scientific Council. Had that been done, it was well known that the desired signatures could never have been obtained. But so far as its statements were concerned, the delay might as well have been considered as chargeable to the Trustees as to the Scientific Council. Its object was to suggest "the propriety of appointing" Dr. Peters as an observer, and that was the point to which the attention of those to whom it was presented for signature was naturally directed. Several of the signatures to this document were, I understand, procured by Professor Hall at the request of Messrs. Olcott and Armsby, from the latter of whom he received it, and who accompanied him during at least part of the time he was thus occupied. Most of the residue of the signatures were, I believe, procured by Dr. Armsby in person. It will thus be seen that this document which is represented by the Trustees as emanating from other parties, was in reality the work of Mr. Olcott and Dr. Armsby, two of their own number. On the *eighth* day of January last Professor Hall

called upon me and requested me to sign what I suppose to have been the paper in question. Owing to various circumstances, the principal of which was an absence for a considerable time from the country, I had heard very little about the Observatory for more than a year, and supposed the relations between the Trustees and the Council to have remained entirely harmonious. I informed Professor Hall that I had lately heard that Dr. Peters had been recalled to his former post in the Coast Survey, and that Dr. Gould was soon coming on to take charge of the Observatory—that I had seen very little of Dr. Peters, and although I entertained the most friendly feelings towards him, I must decline signing the request, until I could feel assured that the arrangement would be agreeable to Professor Bache and his associates. I also questioned Professor Hall as to the ability of the Observatory to pay Dr. Peters an adequate salary, but as to this he did not claim to be informed. As Professor Hall continued to urge his request, I proposed to him that we should see Mr. Olcott in regard to the matter, and we accordingly called at his office.—Mr. Olcott briefly explained to us the general conditions of the funds of the Institution, and stated that notwithstanding certain temporary drawbacks, he thought there would be no difficulty in providing an adequate salary for Dr. Peters—that while the Scientifie Council (one of whom, Dr. Gould, he had seen but a few day previously) might not be willing to advise the appointment of Dr. Peters, he had good reason from his knowledge of their views to feel assured that they would not object to it if made. My confidence in Mr. Olcott's good faith was such, that I at once remarked that if this were so, the objection I had made was met, and I immediately signed the application in his presence. I soon learned how grossly I had been deceived : and it now appears from the "Statement" (see pages 48–50,) under Mr. Olcott's signature, that he knew perfectly well at the time of our interview that the Scientific Council most strenuously objected to retaining Dr. Peters at the Observatory. I leave it to others to characterise this transaction in the terms it merits, and especially the use now attempted to be made of my signature obtained under such circumstances. It is due to Professor Hall to say, that shortly afterwards, when the Scientific Council were in Albany, and personal explanations took place, he frankly and

honorably admitted that he had acted under mistaken impressions in the course he had pursued. As a large number of signatures were procured to the document after mine had been attached, it could not at the earliest have been delivered to the Trustees until late on the eighth of January, and on the ninth it appears that a meeting of the Board was held and the resolutions already referred to adopted. One of these it has before been shown was highly complimentary to the Scientific Council. Yet it is now claimed, at page 58 of the "Statement," that the appointment of Dr. Peters, as an Observer "unless recalled," would have operated "effectually to sever the relations between the Trustees and the Council." Further comment on this transaction is unnecessary.

At pages 127–130 of the "Statement" the Trustees speak of the "guarantee" for the Heliometer, and charge me with having at the citizens' meeting already referred to, "appropriated" to myself "a very just tribute to the desert of another man;" meaning no doubt Dr. Armsby, as they speak on page 128 of his "first guarantee to Professor Bache at Providence," and as Dr. Armsby has signed the Statement, he must be considered as claiming thus much for himself; a claim utterly at variance with his subsequent declarations, and wholly unwarranted by the facts. It is certain that Professor Bache, the person by whom the gaurantee was asked, did not consider Dr. Armsby as having given it, as appears from his letter to Mr. Hawley, quoted by the Trustees, (page 127), and also from the fact that he relied upon receiving my guarantee, which Dr. Armsby promised or expected to procure. It will be recollected by those who are acquainted with the Observatory controversy, that Dr. Armsby after his interview with Professor Bache at Providence in August, 1855, as to the Heliometer, went to Newport, where he supposed I then was, to request me to give an assurance or guarantee that the six thousand dollars needed for the purchase of that instrument should be raised. Finding that I had left Newport, he called on me on his return to Albany, and explained the circumstances and consulted with me about the matter. In view of the importance to the Observatory (then in an entirely dormant state) of the proposed arrangement with Professor Bache, I did not hesitate to express my strong conviction that the money could be raised,

and pledged my efforts if desired, to aid in doing so. Only a few days later, I heard that Mrs. Dudley had most liberally given the amount needed. Immediately after the "defence" of Dr. Gould appeared, Professor Bache, with whom I conversed on this subject, informed me that he had not intended in the defence to use the term "guarantee" in its strict and formal signification, importing that a written instrument had been signed, as that was not pretended by any person ; but as an honorable obligation, implying a promise as satisfactory to him under the circumstances as the most formal document. That Dr. Armsby having spoken of me as the party whose guarantee he expected to procure, and having informed him that the guarantee had been given, he supposed I had given it, and that if there were any mistake about the matter he had been led into it by Dr. Armsby. That what I had said to Dr. Armsby was all the guarantee he had desired ; as he had in substance stated to him at Providence, that if I felt warranted in giving the assurance that in my judgment the project was one which could be carried out, it would be sufficient for his purposes. In order, however, to avoid any misunderstanding or misrepresentation of the matter, as far as I was concerned, I was about to send a note to the *Atlas & Argus* briefly explaining it, but before I was able to do so the meeting of citizens to which the statement refers, was held. Professor Bache, in his remarks at that meeting, related the circumstances which led to the statement in the Defence as to the "guarantee," snbstantially as I have given them, and expressly disclaimed the idea that any "guarantee" had been given in the commercial or legal sense of the term.

As several reporters for the press were in attendance, it appeared to me that the explanation thus made was quite sufficient, especially as the matter was irrelevant to the real questions as to the Observatory then pending. The disingenuousness of the Statement of the Trustees is thus apparent. Its intentional unfairness as to this matter is the more evident, when it is known that in conversation with one of the Trustees who I supposed did not wish to misrepresent me, I communicated these facts to him. He remarked that Professor Bache had at the citizens' meeting, done great injustice to Dr. Armsby in speaking of their interview at Providence, and that I had not controverted the statement. I

reminded him that I was not present at the interview, and that it would have been a very extraordinary proceeding on my part to have questioned Professor Bache's account of it; but that he had candidly and fairly explained my position in reference to the subject. I also remarked to him that the matter having been disposed of at the time by Mrs. Dudley's liberal gift, it was quite immaterial to the merits of the present questions, whether any guarantee had been given or not, especially also, as Professor Bache was the only person who had requested it, but that if he still thought there was any thing in the matter which needed further explanation by me, I would respond in writing to any inquiry he might choose to make. I deeply regretted to find that this Trustee should, under such circumstances, have chosen to unite in a statement of the transaction and in reflections upon my conduct, so entirely unwarranted by the facts.

It may not be amiss for me in closing, to make my acknowledgments to the Trustees for their implied compliment, in speaking of me as "faithful among the faithless"; nor does it detract from its value, that in this instance as in some others, their citation is not entirely correct. They doubtless intended an allusion to him, who was

> ——————"faithful found,
> Among the faithless, faithful only he;"

I trust that at least it may never be my misfortune to forfeit title to the application of another part of the passage—

> "Nor number nor example with him wrought
> To swerve from truth."

JOHN V. L. PRUYN.

ALBANY, October 6, 1858.

NOTE.—On page 5, some of the names of persons are inadvertently misprinted in a part of the edition, but are correctly given on page 30. In frequent instances I have italicised sentences or parts of sentences quoted from the "Statement," for the purpose of calling the special attention of the reader to their import. G. H. T.

3 0112 106067611